DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 347 TM 840 654

AUTHOR Curran, Linda T.; And Others
TITLE Faculty Opinions of the Course-Instructor Survey Program at U.T. Austin. RB-83-13.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Measurement and Evaluation Center.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 145p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Attitude Measures; *College Faculty; *Course Evaluation; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Program Evaluation; School Surveys; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Course Instructor Survey Program; Mail Surveys; *University of Texas Austin

ABSTRACT

Responding to faculty concern about the Course-Instructor Survey (CIS) program at the University of Texas at Austin, the general faculty was surveyed to find obvious trends and identify areas for program revision. CIS annually receives 200,000 student ratings of 8,000 classes and instructors. The results are published in "The Student Guide to Courses and Instructors." In addition to providing students information for course selection and feedback to teachers, student instructor ratings are used increasingly for such administrative decisions as promotion and tenure. The CIS Revision Survey, mailed to approximately 1,900 faculty in the spring of 1982, had a return rate of 29 percent. The analysis summarized faculty response by rank and total group, and presented descriptive statistics. Results indicated the CIS system should be retained with minor revisions. The most useful CIS components were the written comments, the frequency of students choosing each response, and item average score. Faculty felt CIS results are frequently misused by administrators, and rate popularity more than teaching effectiveness. The appendices contain the CIS Revision Survey and the faculty minutes with the University Council Proposal to Redesign the System for Obtaining Student Evaluation and Feedback on Instruction. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250347

FACULTY OPINIONS OF THE COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY PROGRAM AT U.T. AUSTIN

Linda T. Curran, William R. Koch, Marilla D. Svinicki, and Karron G. Lewis

RB-83-13 December 1983

Measurement and Evaluation Center

Research Bulletin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. P. Kelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TM810614

FACULTY OPINIONS OF THE COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY PROGRAM AT U.T. AUSTIN

Linda T. Curran, William R. Koch, Marilla D. Svinicki, and Karron G. Lewis

RB-83-13 December 1983

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION CENTER
The University of Texas at Austin

FACULTY OPINIONS OF THE COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY PROGRAM AT U.T. AUSTIN

Linda T. Curran, William R. Koch, Marilla D. Svinicki, and Karron G. Lewis

Early in the spring semester of 1982, staff members of the Measurement and Evaluation Center (MEC) and of the Center for Teaching Effectiveness (CTE) at The University of Texas at Austin made plans to conduct a campus-wide survey of faculty opinion about the University's Course-Instructor Survey (CIS) program. Impetus for the survey was the heightened concern by faculty members about the use of CIS results for administrative decisions.

The CIS is a program by which the University obtains student ratings of many of its course offerings and their instructors. Administered by the MEC, it is conducted regularly toward the end of each semester and summer term. The present day CIS program has evolved from its student-initiated, off-campus birth of the mid-1960s to its current extensive, University-administered form.

Originally developed and run experimentally by student volunteers, this student evaluation of University courses and instruction was incorporated as a formal University program in the late 1960s as the cost and time demands of the program quickly expanded. Transferred to the MEC, the CIS system now receives almost 200,000 ratings of some 8,000 classes on an annual basis. Results of the CIS evaluations were initially published by students in tabloid form, with permission from participating instructors, for use by other students in their choice of courses the following semester or term. Currently, results of the CIS surveys, when released by faculty members to the public, are published in The Student Guide to Courses and Instructors by the Senior Cabinet and the Students' Association, with support from the Office of the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

At the present time, control of CIS policy and questionnaire development rests in the hands of the separate departments and/or colleges.

Because teaching effectiveness committees in the various departments have developed their own questionnaires for obtaining student ratings, 35 different forms are in current use.

Each semester, the MEC invites the instructor of each course taught on campus to participate in the CIS program. Within limits set by the college or department, the instructor may choose the questionnaire to be administered to his/her class. A student volunteer in each class is asked to pick up the survey forms and answer sheets provided by the MEC, to administer the surveys to the class, and to return the completed answer sheets with the surveys to the MEC. MEC staff members summarize the results and send them in the form of statistical computer printouts to the instructor, along with the completed answer sheets, after grades in the course have been assigned. Most of the instructors have control over the extent of the release of these results--they may retain the results for their own use or release them to the departmental chairperson, to the dean, or to students. If the instructor releases the results to students, the summaries are published in the Student Guide to Courses and Instructors.

For most faculty, participation in the CIS is voluntary, as is control over release of the results. Notable exceptions are the College of Business Administration, the School of Law, and the School of Architecture, in all of which participation and at least partial release of the results are mandatory.

Originally, the two major purposes of the CIS were to disseminate student rating information so that it could be used by other students in their selection of courses and instructors and to provide feedback to instructors about aspects of their teaching. More recently, a third major use has developed--one that rivals and perhaps surpasses the original two in functional terms--namely, the increasing use being made of student ratings of instructors for such administrative purposes as promotion and tenure decisions, merit increases, etc.

With the greater emphasis on the use of CIS results for administrative decisions has come a much higher incidence of faculty concern and complaints.

In particular, many members of the faculty began to contact CTE staff in reaction to their poor CIS results. In the main, these faculty members sought the assistance of CTE staff to improve their teaching effectiveness, but the CIS ratings and the entire CIS system came under closer scrutiny.

Therefore, MEC and CTE staff members decided to pool their resources in an effort to survey the general faculty to collect systematically their evaluations of the CIS program itself. The objectives of the survey were to determine whether or not some obvious trends or consensus existed and, if so, to identify general areas in which the CIS program might be revised to serve better the needs of faculty, students, and administrators.

Method

Materials: Survey

The CIS Revision Survey (see Appendix A) was constructed by MEC and CTE staff members. The questionnaire contained 54 multiple-choice items and 3 free-response items; a 5- or 6-point Likert-type scale was used for the majority of the multiple-choice items. The multiple-choice items asked the respondents to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with certain comments frequently heard about the CIS program, to rate the CIS as an information source, to assess the usefulness of CIS components, to rate some alternative systems for student evaluation, and to assess how easy (or how hard) it is for people to interpret the results of the CIS. The multiple-choice items also requested that the respondents provide background data (e.g., faculty rank) and rate the overall CIS system. The free-response items asked the respondents to indicate their likes and dislikes about the current CIS program and to indicate what changes would make the CIS program more useful.

Procedure: Administration of Survey

The CIS Revision Survey was mailed to approximately 1,900 members of the faculty at U.T. Austin during the spring semester of 1982. A total of 547 faculty members responded to the questionnaire for a return rate of about 29%.

Subjects: Description of the Sample

Of the 542 respondents who indicated their faculty rank on Item 48 of the survey, 25% were assistant professors (N=133), 19% were full professors (N=102), 18% were associate professors (N=95), 14% were assistant instructors (N=74), 11% were teaching assistants (N=59), 9% were a faculty rank other than the ones listed in the item (N=51), and 5% were instructors (N=28).

The respondents were asked (Items 52-54) to indicate the college in which they taught (see Table 1). Eleven individuals indicated that they taught in more than one college and, therefore, are not included in the table. Table 1 presents the college responses by rank. The percentages in each table are column percentages; they represent the proportions of a particular rank that taught in any given college. For the 523 respondents who indicated their college and their faculty rank, the last column shows that most of the respondents taught in Liberal Arts (26.8%) and in Natural Sciences (21.4%). None of the respondents taught in the School of Architecture or in the School of Law. The proportions of the total number of respondents teaching in the Colleges of Business Administration, Education, Engineering, and Fine Arts ranged from 5% to 15%. Fewer than 5% of the respondents taught in each of the remaining colleges/schools (Communication, Library Science, Nursing, Pharmacy, Social Work, and the LBJ School of Public Affairs).

Results

Tables 2-50 present the frequency of responses to Items 1-47, 50, and 51. The distribution of responses is given for each faculty rank and for the total group. Percentages are column percentages; they represent the proportion of faculty members at each rank who chose a particular response. Because of missing data, the number of responses varies from table to table.

Responses to Item 48, which asked the rank of each respondent, are reported above in the description of the sample. Because of multiple marks on the answer sheets, responses to Item 49, which asked the type of course usually taught by each respondent, are not reported here.

Tab

Items 52-54. In which college(s) do you teach?

Response	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Architecture	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Business Administration	10 (10.5%)	5 (5.5%)	19 (14.6%)
Communication	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.4%)	3 (2.3%)
Education	9 (9.5%)	14 (15.4%)	10 (7.7%)
Engineering	14 (14.7%)	9 (9.9%)	16 (12.3%)
Fine Arts	3 (3.2%)	5 (5.5%)	14 (10.8%)
Law	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Liberal Arts	27 (28.4%)	28 (30.8%)	32 (24.6%)
Library Science	3 (3.2%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (0.8%)

le 1

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
2 (7.4%)	20 (27.8%)	15 (25.4%)	6 (12.2%)	77 (14.7%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (2.0%)	11 (2.1%)
3 (11.1%)	11 (15.3%)	3 (5.1%)	7 (14.3%)	57 (10.9%)
2 (7.4%)	6 (8.3%)	7 (11.9%)	7 (14.3%)	61 (11.7%)
1 (3.7%)	2 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.2%)	29 (5.5%)
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
8 (29.6%)	17 (23.6%)	12 (20.3%)	16 (32.7%)	140 (26.8%)
1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (4.1%)	10 (1.9%)

(continued)

Table 1

Items 52-54. In which college(s) do you teach?

Response	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Natural Sciences	25 (26.3%)	21 (23.1%)	24 (18.5%)
Nursing	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	5 (3.8%)
Pharmacy	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)	3 (2.3%)
Social Work	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.5%)
LBJ School	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Total	95 (100.2%)*	91 (100.1%)*	130 (100.0%)

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

(continued)

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	8 (29.6%)	11 (15.3%)	20 (33.9%)	3 (6.1%)	112 (21.4%)
	1 (3.7%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	10 (1.9%)
	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.3%)
	1 (3.7%)	2 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.1%)	8 (1.5%)
	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)
	27 (99.9%)*	72 (100.1%)*	59 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)	523 (99.9%)*

ng error.

Data Analysis

The plan for analysis of the data collected by means of the survey was to summarize faculty responses by rank and for the total group and to present descriptive statistics. Therefore, frequency distributions and percentages of responses to each item were tabulated; also, for a majority of the items, a weighted mean (average) and standard deviation were computed for each rank and for the group as a whole. These statistics are presented in the last two rows of the tables. The mean was obtained by multiplying the value assigned to each response category by the number of responses in that category, adding the resulting values together, and dividing their sum by the total number of responses to that item. For interpretation, high means correspond to favorable faculty responses toward the current CIS system.

The standard deviation is an indication of the variability of the responses to an item. A relatively small standard deviation suggests substantial agreement among responses to an item, while a large standard deviation reflects more disagreement among the faculty, because it indicates that the responses are distributed over a wider range of the continuum.

General Assessment

In Item 1, the respondents were asked to choose among five alternatives the response that best described their current feelings about the overall CIS system (see Table 2). The response most frequently chosen by each faculty rank was that the CIS system should be retained but with minor revisions; 45% of the total group chose this response. Approximately 8% of the total group indicated that the system should be left alone; the assistant instructors and the teaching assistants comprised the highest percentages choosing this response (18.1% and 12.7%, respectively). Only a small percentage of the total group (5.2%) indicated that the CIS system should be abolished. Assistant instructors and teaching assistants were the most positive about the overall CIS system, as evidenced by their high item response mean (3.62 and 3.60, respectively).

Tabl

Item 1. Which of the following best describes your curre

Response [a]		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
system should be left alone	5	11 (11.1%)	5 (5.4%)	4 (3.1%)
system should be retained with minor revisions	4	41 (41.4%)	47 (51.1%)	48 (37.2%)
system should be retained with major revisions	3	26 (26.3%)	21 (22.8%)	46 (35.7%)
each college should administer its own system	2	15 (15.2%)	14 (15.2%)	21 (16.3%)
system should be abolished	1	6 (6.1%)	5 (5.4%)	10 (7.8%)
Total		99 (100.1%)*	92 (99.9%)*	129 (100.1%)*
Mean		3.36	3.36	3.12
Standard Deviation		1.06	0.99	0.98

[a] Weights of this item were reversed so that a higher mea
CIS system.

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

e 2

nt feelings about the overall CIS system?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
0 (0.0%)	13 (18.1%)	7 (12.7%)	3 (6.5%)	43 (8.3%)
17 (65.4%)	33 (45.8%)	29 (52.7%)	18 (39.1%)	233 (44.9%)
5 (19.2%)	14 (19.4%)	10 (18.2%)	8 (17.4%)	130 (25.0%)
4 (15.4%)	10 (13.9%)	8 (14.5%)	14 (30.4%)	86 (16.6%)
0 (0.0%)	2 (2.8%)	1 (1.8%)	3 (6.5%)	27 (5.2%)
26 (100.0%)	72 (100.0%)	55 (99.9%)*	46 (99.9%)*	519 (100.0%)
3.50	3.62	3.60	3.09	3.34
0.76	1.03	0.96	1.11	1.02

n would reflect a more positive attitude towards the

g error.

Commonly Heard Comments

This section of the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate their agreement with five frequently heard comments about the CIS program (see Tables 3-7).

First, the total group agreed slightly that student ratings from the CIS questionnaire do not accurately reflect the quality of their teaching (M = 2.86; see Table 3). Faculty members of "other" ranks (M = 2.56) and assistant professors (M = 2.59) agreed most often with this statement; assistant instructors (M = 3.20) agreed least often with this statement, which seems to indicate that they thought students could rate accurately the quality of their teaching.

Overall, faculty members were slightly positive about only one of the comments--that students are usually knowledgeable enough to give valid ratings of teaching effectiveness (M = 3.18; see Table 4). Assistant instructors (M = 3.68), teaching assistants (M = 3.56), and associate professors (M = 3.16) were the only faculty ranks that agreed students were knowlegeable enough to do so. The rest of the faculty ranks were neutral about the item.

The faculty agreed slightly that student ratings comprise more of a popularity contest than an indicator of teaching effectiveness (M = 2.65; see Table 5). Teaching assistants (M = 3.10) and assistant instructors (M = 3.05) were relatively neutral about this comment; the rest of the faculty ranks agreed that student ratings comprise more of a popularity contest. Approximately one half of the total faculty either agreed or strongly agreed that student ratings are a popularity contest.

For the total faculty, there was slight agreement with the comment that administrators and budget councils frequently misuse the CIS results (M = 2.57; see Table 6). The rank of assistant instructors (M = 2.96) was the only faculty group that was neutral; all other faculty groups agreed with this comment. Roughly one-fifth of the faculty strongly agreed that CIS results are frequently misused by administrators and budget councils.

Table 1

Item 2. Student ratings from the CIS questionnaire do not a

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	I
strongly agree	1	14 (13.9%)	8 (8.4%)	25 (18.8%)	
agree	2	30 (29.7%)	27 (28.4%)	47 (35.3%)	
neutral	3	21 (20.8%)	20 (21.1%)	23 (17.3%)	
disagree	4	30 (29.7%)	35 (36.8%)	33 (24.8%)	
strongly disagree	5	6 (5.9%)	5 (5.3%)	5 (3.8%)	
Total		101 (100.0%)	95 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)	
Mean		2.84	3.02	2.59	
Standard Deviation		1.17	1.10	1.16	

ıccurately reflect the quality of my teaching.

Rank				Total
nstructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (7.1%)	4 (5.4%)	2 (3.4%)	10 (20.0%)	65 (12.0%)
8 (28.6%)	21 (28.4%)	17 (28.8%)	19 (38.0%)	169 (31.3%)
8 (28.6%)	13 (17.6%)	19 (32.2%)	6 (12.0%)	110 (20.4%)
10 (35.7%)	28 (37.8%)	18 (30.5%)	13 (26.0%)	167 (30.9%)
0 (0.0%)	8 (10.8%)	3 (5.1%)	2 (4.0%)	29 (5.4%)
28 (100.0%)	74 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	540 (100.0%)
2.93	3.20	3.05	2.56	2.86
0.98	1.14	0.97	1.20	1.14

Table

Item 3. Students are usually not knowledgeable enough to

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
strongly agree	1	16 (15.7%)	10 (10.5%)	13 (9.8%)
agree	2	26 (25.5%)	21 (22.1%)	45 (33.8%)
neutral	3	14 (13.7%)	13 (13.7%)	18 (13.5%)
disagree	4	34 (33.3%)	46 (48.4%)	46 (34.6%)
strongly disagree	5	12 (11.8%)	5 (5.3%)	11 (8.3%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	95 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		3.00	3.16	2.98
Standard Deviation		1.31	1.15	1.19

*This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

4

give valid ratings of teaching effectiveness.

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
3 (10.7%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.7%)	10 (19.6%)	55 (10.1%)
8 (28.6%)	15 (20.3%)	10 (16.9%)	9 (17.6%)	134 (24.7%)
4 (14.3%)	8 (10.8%)	13 (22.0%)	8 (15.7%)	78 (14.4%)
12 (42.9%)	29 (39.2%)	25 (42.4%)	19 (37.3%)	211 (38.9%)
1 (3.6%)	20 (27.0%)	10 (16.9%)	5 (9.8%)	64 (11.8%)
28 (100.1%)*	74 (100.0%)	59 (99.9%)*	51 (100.0%)	542 (99.9%)*
3.00	3.68	3.56	3.00	3.18
1.16	1.16	1.02	1.33	1.22

error.

-11-

Table

Item 4. Student ratings comprise more of a popularity co

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
strongly agree	1	24 (23.5%)	19 (20.2%)	40 (30.1%)
agree	2	27 (26.5%)	34 (36.2%)	40 (30.1%)
neutral	3	16 (15.7%)	15 (16.0%)	21 (15.8%)
disagree	4	29 (28.4%)	24 (25.5%)	30 (22.6%)
strongly disagree	5	6 (5.9%)	2 (2.1%)	2 (1.5%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	94 (100.0%)	133 (100.1%)*
Mean		2.67	2.53	2.35
Standard Deviation		1.28	1.1[illegible]	1.18

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

ontest than an indicator of teaching effectiveness.

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	6 (21.4%)	8 (10.8%)	7 (11.9%)	13 (25.5%)	117 (21.6%)
	7 (25.0%)	17 (23.0%)	13 (22.0%)	16 (31.4%)	154 (28.5%)
	6 (21.4%)	15 (20.3%)	13 (22.0%)	9 (17.6%)	95 (17.6%)
	9 (32.1%)	31 (41.9%)	19 (32.2%)	10 (19.6%)	152 (28.1%)
	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.1%)	7 (11.9%)	3 (5.9%)	23 (4.3%)
	28 (99.9%)*	74 (100.1%)*	59 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	541 (100.1%)*
	2.64	3.05	3.10	2.49	2.65
	1.16	1.12	1.23	1.24	1.22

ng error.

Tabl

Item 5. Administrators and budget councils frequently m

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
strongly agree	1	26 (25.5%)	20 (21.5%)	35 (26.7%)
agree	2	23 (22.5%)	25 (26.9%)	29 (22.1%)
neutral	3	27 (26.5%)	24 (25.8%)	54 (41.2%)
disagree	4	25 (24.5%)	22 (23.7%)	11 (8.4%)
strongly disagree	5	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (1.5%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	131 (99.9%)*
Mean		2.53	2.58	2.36
Standard Deviation		1.15	1.14	1.02

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of round

e 6

isuse the CIS results.

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	6 (21.4%)	5 (7.1%)	9 (15.5%)	10 (20.4%)	111 (20.9%)
	5 (17.9%)	10 (14.3%)	9 (15.5%)	9 (18.4%)	110 (20.7%)
	13 (46.4%)	43 (61.4%)	37 (63.8%)	23 (46.9%)	221 (41.6%)
	4 (14.3%)	7 (10.0%)	3 (5.2%)	5 (10.2%)	77 (14.5%)
	0 (0.0%)	5 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.1%)	12 (2.3%)
	28 (100.0%)	70 (99.9%)*	58 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)	531 (100.0%)
	2.54	2.96	2.59	2.59	2.57
	1.00	0.91	0.82	1.06	1.05

ing error.

-13-

The faculty agreed that the ratings a student gives for different items often seem to contradict each other (M = 2.39; see Table 7). None of the faculty subgroups disagreed with this comment. About one-fifth of the total group strongly agreed that student ratings for different items often seem to contradict each other.

The CIS as an Information Source

This part of the questionnaire asked the respondents to rate the current CIS as an information source in five situations (see Tables 8-12). The CIS as an information source was rated the highest by the total group when it was used by the individual instructor for general teaching improvement (M = 3.76; see Table 8). Assistant instructors and teaching assistants provided the highest means on this item (M = 3.97 and M = 3.92, respectively) and thereby seemed to indicate that they saw the CIS as a good information source when it was used for general teaching improvement.

The faculty also found the CIS to be a good information source when used for specific course improvement (M = 3.69; see Table 9). Assistant instructors were the most positive (M = 3.89) about the CIS as an information source for this use.

The total group rated the CIS as a slightly poor information source when used by students to select courses (M = 2.51; see Table 10). "Other" faculty (M = 2.22), professors (M = 2.31), and assistant professors (M = 2.36) were the least positive about using the CIS to select courses. Slightly more than one-fourth of the faculty rated the CIS as a poor source of information in this respect.

The CIS was rated by the faculty as a slightly poor information source when used by administrators to assist faculty in setting teaching improvement goals (M = 2.75; see Table 11). Instructors (M = 2.96), assistant instructors (M = 2.97), and teaching assistants (M = 3.05) were uncertain about their ratings of this item. The rest of the faculty ranks rated the CIS as a poor information source when they set goals for teaching improvement.

Tabl

Item 6. The ratings a student gives for different items

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
strongly agree	1	24 (23.5%)	18 (19.1%)	38 (28.6%)
agree	2	36 (35.3%)	43 (45.7%)	49 (36.8%)
neutral	3	21 (20.6%)	18 (19.1%)	22 (16.5%)
disagree	4	20 (19.6%)	13 (13.8%)	21 (15.8%)
strongly disagree	5	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.1%)	3 (2.3%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	94 (99.8%)*	133 (100.0%)
Mean		2.39	2.34	2.26
Standard Deviation		1.08	1.01	1.11

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

often seem to contradict each other.

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	6 (22.2%)	13 (18.3%)	8 (13.8%)	12 (23.5%)	119 (22.2%)
	11 (40.7%)	27 (38.0%)	13 (22.4%)	23 (45.1%)	202 (37.7%)
	6 (22.2%)	10 (14.1%)	26 (44.8%)	9 (17.6%)	112 (20.9%)
	4 (14.8%)	17 (23.9%)	10 (17.2%)	6 (11.8%)	91 (17.0%)
	0 (0.0%)	4 (5.6%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (2.0%)	12 (2.2%)
	27 (99.9%)*	71 (99.9%)*	58 (99.9%)*	51 (100.0%)	536 (100.0%)
	2.30	2.61	2.71	2.24	2.39
	0.99	1.20	0.97	1.01	1.08

ng error.

Table

Item 7. How would you rate the CIS as it currently exist
instructor for general teaching improvement?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
poor source	1	8 (7.8%)	6 (6.3%)	13 (9.8%)
	2	10 (9.8%)	8 (8.4%)	14 (10.5%)
uncertain	3	14 (13.7%)	11 (11.6%)	17 (12.8%)
	4	39 (38.2%)	43 (45.3%)	64 (48.1%)
good source	5	31 (30.4%)	27 (28.4%)	25 (18.8%)
Total		102 (99.9%)*	95 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		3.74	3.81	3.56
Standard Deviation		1.22	1.13	1.20

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

8

s as an information source when used by the individual

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	3 (10.7%)	3 (4.1%)	3 (5.1%)	3 (5.9%)	39 (7.2%)
	2 (7.1%)	6 (8.1%)	4 (6.8%)	5 (9.8%)	49 (9.0%)
	4 (14.3%)	6 (8.1%)	11 (18.6%)	9 (17.6%)	72 (13.3%)
	9 (32.1%)	34 (45.9%)	18 (30.5%)	18 (35.3%)	225 (41.5%)
	10 (35.7%)	25 (33.8%)	23 (39.0%)	16 (31.4%)	157 (29.0%)
	28 (99.9%)*	74 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	542 (100.0%)
	3.75	3.97	3.92	3.77	3.76
	1.32	1.06	1.15	1.18	1.17

g error.

28

Table

Item 8. How would you rate the CIS as it currently exist
instructor for specific course improvement?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
poor source	1	5 (4.9%)	8 (8.4%)	8 (6.0%)
	2	14 (13.7%)	6 (6.3%)	20 (15.0%)
uncertain	3	14 (13.7%)	16 (16.8%)	18 (13.5%)
	4	37 (36.3%)	38 (40.0%)	67 (50.4%)
good source	5	32 (31.4%)	27 (28.4%)	20 (15.0%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	95 (99.9%)*	133 (99.9%)*
Mean		3.76	3.74	3.53
Standard Deviation		1.18	1.19	1.11

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

9

s as an information source when used by the individual

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
4 (14.3%)	3 (4.1%)	1 (1.7%)	4 (7.8%)	33 (6.1%)
3 (10.7%)	8 (11.0%)	4 (6.8%)	2 (3.9%)	57 (10.5%)
5 (17.9%)	8 (11.0%)	18 (30.5%)	11 (21.6%)	90 (16.6%)
11 (39.3%)	29 (39.7%)	22 (37.3%)	23 (45.1%)	227 (42.0%)
5 (17.9%)	25 (34.2%)	14 (23.7%)	11 (21.6%)	134 (24.8%)
28 (100.1%)*	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	541 (100.0%)
3.36	3.89	3.75	3.69	3.69
1.31	1.13	0.96	1.10	1.14

g error.

-17-

Table

Item 9. How would you rate the CIS as it currently exis
select courses?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
poor source	1	35 (34.7%)	17 (18.3%)	46 (34.6%)
	2	15 (14.9%)	25 (26.9%)	18 (13.5%)
uncertain	3	40 (39.6%)	33 (35.5%)	47 (35.3%)
	4	7 (6.9%)	13 (14.0%)	19 (14.3%)
good source	5	4 (4.0%)	5 (5.4%)	3 (2.3%)
Total		101 (100.1%)*	93 (100.1%)*	133 (100.0%)
Mean		2.31	2.61	2.36
Standard Deviation		1.14	1.10	1.16

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

10

ts as an information source when used by students to

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	6 (21.4%)	10 (13.5%)	13 (22.0%)	17 (34.7%)	144 (26.8%)
	5 (17.9%)	12 (16.2%)	10 (16.9%)	8 (16.3%)	93 (17.3%)
	11 (39.3%)	35 (47.3%)	18 (30.5%)	20 (40.8%)	204 (38.0%)
	4 (14.3%)	15 (20.3%)	15 (25.4%)	4 (8.2%)	77 (14.3%)
	2 (7.1%)	2 (2.7%)	3 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (3.5%)
	28 (100.0%)	74 (100.0%)	59 (99.9%)*	49 (100.0%)	537 (99.9%)*
	2.68	2.82	2.75	2.22	2.51
	1.19	1.00	1.21	1.03	1.14

ng error.

Table

Item 10. How would you rate the CIS as it currently exi
to assist faculty in setting teaching improvem

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
poor source	1	18 (17.8%)	19 (20.4%)	41 (31.3%)
	2	19 (18.8%)	19 (20.4%)	22 (16.8%)
uncertain	3	32 (31.7%)	25 (26.9%)	39 (29.8%)
	4	27 (26.7%)	23 (24.7%)	26 (19.8%)
good source	5	5 (5.0%)	7 (7.5%)	3 (2.3%)
Total		101 (100.0%)	93 (99.9%)*	131 (100.0%)
Mean		2.82	2.79	2.45
Standard Deviation		1.16	1.24	1.19

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

11

sts as an information source when used by administrators
ent goals?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Ass'stant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	5 (17.9%)	7 (9.7%)	8 (13.8%)	14 28.0%)	112 (21.0%)
	2 (7.1%)	10 (13.9%)	6 (10.3%)	9 (18.0%)	87 (16.3%)
	12 (42.9%)	38 (52.8%)	23 (39.7%)	16 (32.0%)	185 (34.7%)
	7 (25.0%)	12 (16.7%)	17 (29.3%)	9 (18.0%)	121 (22.7%)
	2 (7.1%)	5 (6.9%)	4 (6.9%)	2 (4.0%)	28 (5.3%)
	28 (100.0%)	72 (100.0%)	58 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	533 (100.0%)
	2.96	2.97	3.05	2.52	2.75
	1.17	0.99	1.12	1.20	1.18

ng error.

-19-

The CIS was rated as a slightly poor information source when used by administrators to compare teaching of faculty members for merit raises, promotions, and tenure decisions (M = 2.50; see Table 12). Assistant professors (M = 2.27) and the "other" faculty rank (M = 2.33) were the most negative about using the CIS as an information source in this situation.

Usefulness of the Components

Items 12 through 23 (see Tables 13-24) asked the respondents to assess the usefulness of certain parts of the current CIS and the printout of its results. The faculty had the option of indicating that the item was not applicable to them. The means of the items presented in the tables were computed without the "not applicable" responses. Overall, the faculty either rated the CIS components as useful, or they were indifferent to them in their ratings.

The part of the CIS results that reports the frequencies of students choosing each response was rated as useful by the faculty (M = 3.81; see Table 13). For this part of the CIS, instructors gave the highest ratings (M = 4.18), while professors gave the lowest ratings (M = 3.50). Over two-thirds of the faculty rated the frequency of students choosing each response as useful information.

The part of the CIS results that reports the average score on each item was rated as useful by the faculty (M = 3.65; see Table 14). The average score was rated the highest by assistant instructors (M = 4.00), instructors (M = 3.89), and associate professors (M = 3.71). Approximately 65% of the faculty rated the average score on each item as useful information.

Faculty members were uncertain in their rating of the usefulness of the breakdown of the percent "below, same, and above" on each item (M = 3.03; see Table 15).[1] Assistant instructors were the only faculty group

[1] The percent below, the percent same, and the percent above for each item indicate the percentage of classes in which the item average for that particular item was lower than, the same as, or higher than a given class average for that item.

Tabl

Item 11. How would you rate the CIS as it currently ex
to compare teaching of faculty members for me

Response				
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
poor source	1	27 (27.3%)	27 (28.7%)	54 (40.6%)
	2	24 (24.2%)	22 (23.4%)	23 (17.3%)
uncertain	3	22 (22.2%)	15 (16.0%)	28 (21.1%)
	4	17 (17.2%)	22 (23.4%)	22 (16.5%)
good source	5	9 (9.1%)	8 (8.5%)	6 (4.5%)
Total		99 (100.0%)	94 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		2.57	2.60	2.27
Standard Deviation		1.30	1.35	1.27

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of round

e 12

ists as an information source when used by administrators
rit raises, promotion, tenure decisions?

	Rank				Total
t r	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	12 (44.4%)	18 (24.7%)	15 (25.4%)	16 (31.4%)	169 (31.5%)
	2 (7.4%)	12 (16.4%)	9 (15.3%)	11 (21.6%)	103 (19.2%)
	5 (18.5%)	26 (35.6%)	18 (30.5%)	17 (33.3%)	131 (24.4%)
	6 (22.2%)	11 (15.1%)	11 (18.6%)	5 (9.8%)	94 (17.5%)
	2 (7.4%)	6 (8.2%)	6 (10.2%)	2 (3.9%)	39 (7.3%)
	27 (99.9%)*	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	536 (99.9%)*
	2.41	2.66	2.73	2.33	2.50
	1.45	1.24	1.31	1.14	1.30

ing error.

Table

Item 12. How would you assess the usefulness of the fre

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	14 (13.9%)	7 (7.6%)	10 (7.6%)
	2	10 (9.9%)	5 (5.4%)	8 (6.1%)
uncertain	3	16 (15.8%)	13 (14.1%)	15 (11.4%)
	4	32 (31.7%)	33 (35.9%)	49 (37.1%)
very useful	5	28 (27.7%)	32 (34.8%)	47 (35.6%)
not applicable	6	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.2%)	3 (2.3%)
Total		101 (100.0%)	92 (100.0%)	132 (100.1%)*
Mean		3.50	3.87	3.89
Standard Deviation		1.37	1.19	1.19

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

13

quency of students choosing each response?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	3 (10.7%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (6.0%)	41 (7.7%)
	1 (3.6%)	7 (9.6%)	6 (10.2%)	4 (8.0%)	41 (7.7%)
	5 (17.9%)	6 (8.2%)	14 (23.7%)	11 (22.0%)	80 (15.0%)
	9 (32.1%)	19 (26.0%)	20 (33.9%)	17 (34.0%)	179 (33.5%)
	10 (35.7%)	39 (53.4%)	16 (27.1%)	15 (30.0%)	187 (35.0%)
	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.3%)
	28 (100.0%)	73 (99.9%)*	59 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	535 (100.2%)*
	3.79	4.18	3.72	3.74	3.81
	1.29	1.11	1.09	1.16	1.22

ng error.

Table

Item 13. How would you assess the usefulness of the ave

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	16 (15.7%)	7 (7.4%)	14 (10.5%)
	2	7 (6.9%)	6 (6.4%)	14 (10.5%)
uncertain	3	13 (12.7%)	21 (22.3%)	21 (15.8%)
	4	43 (42.2%)	33 (35.1%)	52 (39.1%)
very useful	5	23 (22.5%)	27 (28.7%)	31 (23.3%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	94 (99.9%)*	133 (100.0%)
Mean		3.49	3.71	3.55
Standard Deviation		1.34	1.17	1.26

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

14

rage score on each item?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	2 (7.1%)	4 (5.5%)	3 (5.1%)	6 (12.0%)	52 (9.6%)
	2 (7.1%)	4 (5.5%)	5 (8.5%)	5 (10.0%)	43 (8.0%)
	3 (10.7%)	9 (12.3%)	16 (27.1%)	8 (16.0%)	91 (16.9%)
	10 (35.7%)	27 (37.0%)	18 (30.5%)	21 (42.0%)	204 (37.8%)
	10 (35.7%)	29 (39.7%)	16 (27.1%)	10 (20.0%)	146 (27.1%)
	1 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.6%)
	28 (99.9%)*	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	539 (100.0%)
	3.89	4.00	3.67	3.48	3.65
	1.22	1.12	1.13	1.27	1.23

ng error.

Table 1

Item 14. How would you assess the usefulness of the perce

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	22 (21.8%)	21 (22.3%)	38 (28.6%)
	2	8 (7.9%)	10 (10.6%)	18 (13.5%)
uncertain	3	27 (26.7%)	25 (26.6%)	28 (21.1%)
	4	28 (27.7%)	20 (21.3%)	24 (18.0%)
very useful	5	16 (15.8%)	18 (19.1%)	21 (15.8%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (3.0%)
Total		101 (99.9%)*	94 (99.9%)*	133 (100.0%)
Mean		3.08	3.04	2.78
Standard Deviation		1.37	1.41	1.46

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

5

nt below, same, and above breakdown on each item?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
5 (17.9%)	9 (12.3%)	9 (15.5%)	11 (22.0%)	115 (21.4%)
4 (14.3%)	10 (13.7%)	7 (12.1%)	8 (16.0%)	65 (12.1%)
7 (25.0%)	15 (20.5%)	19 (32.8%)	11 (22.0%)	132 (24.6%)
9 (32.1%)	20 (27.4%)	13 (22.4%)	12 (24.0%)	126 (23.5%)
3 (10.7%)	17 (23.3%)	8 (13.8%)	8 (16.0%)	91 (16.9%)
0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (1.5%)
28 (100.0%)	73 (99.9%)*	58 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	537 (100.0%)
3.04	3.37	3.07	2.96	3.03
1.29	1.33	1.26	1.40	1.39

; error.

that rated the breakdowns on each item as useful (M = 3.37). Assistant professors were the only faculty group that rated the breakdowns on each item as slightly not useful (M = 2.78).

As with the previous item, faculty members were indifferent in their rating of the percentile rank on each item (M = 3.04; see Table 16). Assistant instructors (M = 3.59), teaching assistants (M = 3.33), and professors (M = 3.24) rated the percentile ranks as useful, while the assistant professors (M = 2.50) rated the percentile rank on each item as not useful.

Members of the faculty were also uncertain in their rating of the global rating items (M = 3.06; see Table 17). Assistant instructors (M = 3.51), instructors (M = 3.44), and associate professors (M = 3.26) rated the global rating items as useful, while the assistant professors (M = 2.65) rated the global rating items as slightly not useful.

The faculty rated as useful the explanatory material which accompanies the results (M = 3.26; see Table 18). Assistant instructors (M = 3.92) and teaching assistants (M = 3.75) gave the highest ratings to the explanatory material; professors (M = 3.20) and assistant professors (M = 3.37) gave the explanatory material the lowest, although still favorable, rating.

The faculty was uncertain about the usefulness of CIS results pertaining to student demographic information (M = 2.99; see Table 19). It was rated as slightly useful by the assistant instructors (M = 3.29), instructors (M = 3.19), other faculty (M = 3.17), and teaching assistants (M = 3.11). Professors (M = 2.63) were the most negative about the usefulness of the student demographic information.

Faculty members were also uncertain in their ratings of the usefulness of the student estimates of course grades (M = 2.97; see Table 20). High usefulness ratings of the student estimate of course grade were given by instructors (M = 3.46) and teaching assistants (M = 3.45). Professors gave the lowest ratings (M = 2.46) to the usefulness of the student estimate of course grade.

Table

Item 15. How would you assess the usefulness of the per

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	21 (20.6%)	25 (26.9%)	52 (39.1%)
	2	11 (10.8%)	10 (10.8%)	18 (13.5%)
uncertain	3	19 (18.6%)	12 (12.9%)	21 (15.8%)
	4	25 (24.5%)	24 (25.8%)	21 (15.8%)
very useful	5	26 (25.5%)	21 (22.6%)	18 (13.5%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (2.3%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	133 (100.0%)
Mean		3.24	3.07	2.50
Standard Deviation		1.47	1.55	1.49

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

centile rank on each item?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	5 (18.5%)	9 (12.3%)	7 (12.1%)	15 (30.0%)	134 (25.0%)
	6 (22.2%)	6 (8.2%)	8 (13.8%)	5 (10.0%)	64 (11.9%)	
	3 (11.1%)	11 (15.1%)	16 (27.6%)	8 (16.0%)	90 (16.8%)
	9 (33.3%)	24 (32.9%)	11 (19.0%)	13 (26.0%)	127 (23.7%)
	3 (11.1%)	21 (28.8%)	15 (25.9%)	9 (18.0%)	113 (21.1%)
	1 (3.7%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (1.5%)
	27 (99.9%)*	73 (100.0%)	58 (100.1%)*	50 (100.0%)	536 (100.0%)
	2.96	3.59	3.33	2.92	3.04
	1.37	1.34	1.34	1.52	1.50

ng error.

Table

Item 16. How would you assess the usefulness of the globa
instructors. . . . ")?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	23 (22.5%)	23 (24.5%)	45 (33.8%)
	2	15 (14.7%)	7 (7.4%)	20 (15.0%)
uncertain	3	13 (12.7%)	14 (14.9%)	22 (16.5%)
	4	25 (24.5%)	23 (24.5%)	26 (19.5%)
very useful	5	26 (25.5%)	27 (28.7%)	19 (14.3%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)
Total		102 (99.9%)*	94 (100.0%)	133 (99.9%)*
Mean		3.16	3.26	2.65
Standard Deviation		1.52	1.55	1.48

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

17

al rating items (e.g., "compared with all other

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	2 (7.1%)	10 13.7%)	14 (24.1%)	15 (30 0%)	132 (24.5%)
	5 (17.9%)	5 (6.8%)	7 (12.1%)	6 (12.0%)	65 (12.1%)
	5 (17.9%)	17 (23.3%)	11 (19.0%)	7 (14.0%)	89 (16.5%)
	9 (32.1%)	18 (24.7%)	13 (22.4%)	11 (22.0%)	125 (23.2%)
	6 (21.4%)	22 (30.1%)	9 (15.5%)	10 (20.0%)	119 (22.1%)
	1 (3.6%)	1 (1.4%)	4 (6.9%)	1 (2.0%)	8 (1.5%)
	28 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	58 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	538 (99.9%)*
	3.44	3.51	2.93	2.90	3.06
	1.25	1.36	1.45	1.56	1.50

g error.

-27-

Tab

Item 17. How would you assess the usefulness of the e

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistan Professo
not useful	1	14 (13.7%)	6 (6.5%)	18 (13.5%
	2	22 (21.6%)	11 (12.0%)	17 (12.8%
uncertain	3	20 (19.6%)	16 (17.4%)	24 (18.0%
	4	22 (21.6%)	32 (34.8%)	42 (31.6%
very useful	5	24 (23.5%)	27 (29.3%)	30 (22.6%
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.5%
Total		102 (100.0%)	92 (100.0%)	133 (100.0
Mean		3.20	3.69	3.37
Standard Deviation		1.38	1.20	1.34

le 18

xplanatory material which accompanies the results?

	Rank				Total
nt or	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
)	1 (3.6%)	6 (8.2%)	3 (5.2%)	5 (10.0%)	53 (9.9%)
)	2 (7.1%)	1 (1.4%)	4 (6.9%)	2 (4.0%)	59 (11.0%)
)	9 (32.1%)	13 (17.8%)	17 (29.3%)	12 (24.0%)	111 (20.7%)
)	8 (28.6%)	25 (34.2%)	13 (22.4%)	15 (30.0%)	157 (29.3%)
)	7 (25.0%)	27 (37.0%)	20 (34.5%)	16 (32.0%)	151 (28.2%)
)	1 (3.6%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.9%)
%)	28 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	58 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	536 (100.0%)
	3.67	3.92	3.75	3.70	3.55
	1.07	1.17	1.17	1.25	1.28

Table

Item 18. How would you assess the usefulness of the stu

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	23 (22.5%)	14 (15.1%)	22 (16.5%)
	2	25 (24.5%)	14 (15.1%)	24 (18.0%)
uncertain	3	30 (29.4%)	32 (34.4%)	30 (22.6%)
	4	15 (14.7%)	23 (24.7%)	35 (26.3%)
very useful	5	9 (8.8%)	8 (8.6%)	14 (10.5%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.2%)	8 (6.0%)
Total		102 (99.9%)*	93 (100.1%)*	133 (99.9%)*
Mean		2.63	2.97	2.96
Standard Deviation		1.23	1.18	1.28

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

19

ident demographic information in general?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	3 (10.7%)	8 (11.0%)	4 (6.9%)	5 (10.0%)	79 (14.7%)
	4 (14.3%)	11 (15.1%)	9 (15.5%)	9 (18.0%)	96 (17.9%)
	7 (25.0%)	13 (17.8%)	25 (43.1%)	12 (24.0%)	149 (27.7%)
	9 (32.1%)	29 (39.7%)	13 (22.4%)	13 (26.0%)	137 (25.5%)
	3 (10.7%)	9 (12.3%)	5 (8.6%)	7 (14.0%)	55 (10.2%)
	2 (7.1%)	3 (4.1%)	2 (3.4%)	4 (8.0%)	21 (3.9%)
	28 (99.9%)*	73 (100.0%)	58 (99.9%)*	50 (100.0%)	537 (99.9%)*
	3.19	3.29	3.11	3.17	2.99
	1.20	1.22	1.02	1.24	1.22

ng error.

-29-

Table

Item 19. How would you assess the usefulness of the stu

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	28 (27.5%)	19 (20.4%)	28 (21.1%)
	2	26 (25.5%)	14 (15.1%)	21 (15.8%)
uncertain	3	27 (26.5%)	25 (26.9%)	23 (17.3%)
	4	13 (12.7%)	19 (20.4%)	39 (29.3%)
very useful	5	7 (6.9%)	15 (16.1%)	18 (13.5%)
not applicable	6	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (3.0%)
Total		102 (100.1%)*	93 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		2.46	2.97	2.98
Standard Deviation		1.22	1.36	1.38

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

20

lent estimate of course grade?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	3 (10.7%)	13 (17.8%)	3 (5.2%)	7 (14.3%)	101 (18.8%)
	1 (3.6%)	12 (16.4%)	9 (15.5%)	9 (18.4%)	92 (17.2%)
	11 (39.3%)	20 (27.4%)	14 (24.1%)	10 (20.4%)	130 (24.3%)
	6 (21.4%)	16 (21.9%)	20 (34.5%)	17 (34.7%)	130 (24.3%)
	7 (25.0%)	12 (16.4%)	10 (17.2%)	4 (8.2%)	73 (13.6%)
	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.4%)	2 (4.1%)	10 (1.9%)
	28 (100.0%)	73 (99.9%)*	58 (99.9%)*	49 (100.1%)*	536 (100.1%)*
	3.46	3.03	3.45	3.04	2.97
	1.23	1.33	1.13	1.23	1.32

ng error.

-30-

The faculty rated the reported student grade point average as slightly useful (M = 3.25; see Table 21). Each faculty group rated the student grade point average as useful; the highest ratings were given by instructors (M = 3.75), teaching assistants (M = 3.50), other faculty (M = 3.44), and assistant instructors (M = 3.31).

Information about their students' academic majors was rated as slightly useful by the faculty (M = 3.16; see Table 22). The instructors (M = 3.64), teaching assistants (M = 3.63), and assistant instructors (M = 3.43) gave the students' majors the highest usefulness ratings, while professors (M = 2.88) rated the students' majors as slightly not useful.

The faculty rated the information about the reason for taking the course as slightly useful (M = 3.36; see Table 23). This information received the highest ratings from instructors (M = 4.07), teaching assistants (M = 3.64), and assistant instructors (M = 3.57). This item was not applicable to approximately 6% of the faculty.

The written comments made by the students on their CIS answer sheets were perceived as very useful by approximately three-fourths of the faculty (M = 4.61; see Table 24). Indicating that this part of the CIS results is of the most help to them, each faculty group rated the written comments above a mean of 4.50.

Ease of Interpretation

This section of the CIS Revision Survey asked the respondents to assess how easy it is for people in certain groups to interpret the results of the CIS as they are currently presented (see Tables 25-28). Speaking for themselves, faculty members believe that CIS results are somewhat easy to interpret (M = 3.47; see Table 25). Professors (M = 3.75) and assistant instructors (M = 3.62) thought that they could interpret the results the easiest.

The faculty was unsure as to how easy it is for faculty members in general to interpret the CIS results (M = 3.05; see Table 26). Assistant

Table 21

Item 20. How would you assess the usefulness of the student

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	In
not useful	1	16 (15.7%)	17 (18.3%)	22 (16.5%)	
	2	16 (15.7%)	10 (10.8%)	21 (15.8%)	
uncertain	3	26 (25.5%)	27 (29.0%)	26 (19.5%)	
	4	31 (30.4%)	21 (22.6%)	33 (24.8%)	
very useful	5	13 (12.7%)	16 (17.2%)	26 (19.5%)	
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.2%)	5 (3.8%)	
Total		102 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	133 (99.9%)*	
Mean		3.09	3.10	3.16	
Standard Deviation		1.27	1.34	1.38	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding e

grade point average?

Rank				Total
structor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
3 (10.7%)	13 (17.8%)	1 (1.7%)	5 (10.0%)	77 (14.3%)
0 (0.0%)	6 (8.2%)	8 (13.6%)	5 (10.0%)	66 (12.3%)
7 (25.0%)	15 (20.5%)	16 (27.1%)	12 (24.0%)	129 (24.0%)
9 (32.1%)	22 (30.1%)	24 (40.7%)	16 (32.0%)	156 (29.0%)
9 (32.1%)	16 (21.9%)	7 (11.9%)	10 (20.0%)	97 (18.0%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (5.1%)	2 (4.0%)	13 (2.4%)
28 (99.9%)*	73 (99.9%)*	59 (100.1%)*	50 (100.0%)	538 (100.0%)
3.75	3.31	3.50	3.44	3.25
1.24	1.39	0.95	1.24	1.30

rror.

Table

Item 21. How would you assess the usefulness of the stud

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	21 (20.6%)	20 (21.7%)	31 (23.3%)
	2	17 (16.7%)	8 (8.7%)	17 (12.8%)
uncertain	3	29 (28.4%)	19 (20.7%)	22 (16.5%)
	4	21 (20.6%)	23 (25.0%)	37 (27.8%)
very useful	5	13 (12.7%)	17 (18.5%)	19 (14.3%)
not applicable	6	1 (1.0%)	5 (5.4%)	7 (5.3%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	92 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		2.88	3.10	2.97
Standard Deviation		1.31	1.44	1.43

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

22

ent major?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	2 (7.1%)	9 (12.3%)	3 (5.1%)	7 (14.3%)	93 (17.4%)
	0 (0.0%)	8 (11.0%)	5 (8.5%)	8 (16.3%)	63 (11.8%)
	10 (35.7%)	14 (19.2%)	14 (23.7%)	16 (32.7%)	124 (23.1%)
	10 (35.7%)	22 (30.1%)	23 (39.0%)	7 (14.3%)	143 (26.7%)
	6 (21.4%)	17 (23.3%)	12 (20.3%)	9 (18.4%)	93 (17.4%)
	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.1%)	2 (3.4%)	2 (4.1%)	20 (3.7%)
	28 (99.9%)*	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	49 (100.1%)*	536 (100.1%)*
	3.64	3.43	3.63	3.06	3.16
	1.06	1.33	1.08	1.31	1.35

g error.

Table 2

Item 22. How would you assess the usefulness of the reasc

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
not useful	1	17 (16.7%)	13 (14.0%)	24 (18.2%)
	2	14 (13.7%)	7 (7.5%)	16 (12.1%)
uncertain	3	21 (20.6%)	32 (34.4%)	16 (12.1%)
	4	30 (29.4%)	22 (23.7%)	38 (28.8%)
very useful	5	14 (13.7%)	17 (18.3%)	27 (20.5%)
not applicable	6	6 (5.9%)	2 (2.2%)	11 (8.3%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	132 (100.0%)
Mean		3.10	3.25	3.23
Standard Deviation		1.33	1.26	1.45

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

:3

on for taking [the] course?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
1 (3.6%)	8 (11.0%)	3 (5.1%)	6 (12.0%)	72 (13.4%)
1 (3.6%)	4 (5.5%)	5 (8.5%)	4 (8.0%)	51 (9.5%)
4 (14.3%)	13 (17.8%)	11 (18.6%)	11 (22.0%)	108 (20.1%)
11 (39.3%)	29 (39.7%)	27 (45.8%)	16 (32.0%)	173 (32.2%)
11 (39.3%)	15 (20.5%)	10 (16.9%)	9 (18.0%)	103 (19.2%)
0 (0.0%)	4 (5.5%)	3 (5.1%)	4 (8.0%)	30 (5.6%)
28 (100.1%)*	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	537 (100.0%)
4.07	3.57	3.64	3.39	3.36
1.02	1.23	1.05	1.27	1.30

g error.

Tabl

Item 23. How would you assess the usefulness of the wr

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistan Professo
not useful	1	4 (3.9%)	3 (3.2%)	1 (0.8%)
	2	2 (2.0%)	3 (3.2%)	4 (3.0%)
uncertain	3	5 (4.9%)	2 (2.2%)	5 (3.8%)
	4	17 (16.7%)	21 (22.6%)	24 (18.0%)
very useful	5	74 (72.5%)	64 (68.8%)	99 (74.4%)
not applicable	6	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total		102 (100.0%)	93 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		4.52	4.51	4.62
Standard Deviation		0.97	0.94	0.77

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of round

le 24

ritten comments?

t r	Rank: Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	Total
)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	10 (1.9%)
)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (2.0%)
)	1 (3.6%)	4 (5.5%)	4 (6.8%)	3 (5.9%)	24 (4.5%)
)	7 (25.0%)	4 (5.5%)	5 (8.5%)	11 (21.6%)	89 (16.5%)
)	20 (71.4%)	62 (84.9%)	46 (78.0%)	36 (70.6%)	401 (74.4%)
)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.7%)
)	28 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	59 (100.1%)*	51 (100.1%)*	539 (100.0%)
	4.68	4.78	4.67	4.59	4.61
	0.55	0.68	0.76	0.78	0.82

ding error.

Tabl

Item 24. How easy do you think it is for [you] yoursel
presented?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistan Professo
very difficult	1	7 (7.3%)	9 (9.7%)	15 (11.4%)
	2	11 (11.5%)	13 (14.0%)	23 (17.4%)
not sure	3	5 (5.2%)	9 (9.7%)	20 (15.2%)
	4	49 (51.0%)	45 (48.4%)	47 (35.6%)
very easy	5	24 (25.0%)	17 (18.3%)	27 (20.5%)
Total		96 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	132 (100.1%)
Mean		3.75	3.52	3.36
Standard Deviation		1.17	1.22	1.30

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of round

e 25

f to interpret the results of the CIS as they are currently

t r	Rank: Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	Total
	3 (11.5%)	3 (4.1%)	5 (8.9%)	9 (18.0%)	51 (9.7%)
	4 (15.4%)	13 (17.8%)	8 (14.3%)	10 (20.0%)	82 (15.6%)
	3 (11.5%)	5 (6.8%)	15 (26.8%)	6 (12.0%)	63 (12.0%)	-36-
	12 (46.2%)	40 (54.8%)	17 (30.4%)	17 (34.0%)	227 (43.2%)
	4 (15.4%)	12 (16.4%)	11 (19.6%)	8 (16.0%)	103 (19.6%)
*	26 (100.0%)	73 (99.9%)*	56 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	526 (100.1%)*
	3.39	3.62	3.38	3.10	3.47
	1.27	1.09	1.21	1.39	1.24

ling error.

65

Table

Item 25. How easy do you think it is for faculty member
they are currently presented?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
very difficult	1	12 (12.5%)	13 (14.0%)	17 (12.9%)
	2	12 (12.5%)	18 (19.4%)	32 (24.2%)
not sure	3	35 (36.5%)	27 (29.0%)	41 (31.1%)
	4	29 (30.2%)	33 (35.5%)	29 (22.0%)
very easy	5	8 (8.3%)	2 (2.2%)	13 (9.8%)
Total		96 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	132 (100.0%)
Mean		3.09	2.93	2.92
Standard Deviation		1.13	1.10	1.17

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

s in general to interpret the results of the CIS as

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	3 (11.5%)	3 (4.1%)	4 (7.3%)	6 (12.2%)	58 (11.1%)
	3 (11.5%)	9 (12.3%)	7 (12.7%)	7 (14.3%)	88 (16.8%)
	9 (34.6%)	32 (43.8%)	25 (45.5%)	19 (38.8%)	188 (35.9%)
	8 (30.8%)	24 (32.9%)	15 (27.3%)	11 (22.4%)	149 (28.4%)
	3 (11.5%)	5 (6.8%)	4 (7.3%)	6 (12.2%)	41 (7.8%)
	26 (99.9%)*	73 (99.9%)*	55 (100.1%)*	49 (99.9%)*	524 (100.0%)
	3.19	3.26	3.15	3.08	3.05
	1.17	0.91	0.99	1.17	1.10

ng error.

instructors (M = 3.26), instructors (M = 3.19), and teaching assistants (M = 3.15) thought faculty members in general could interpret the CIS results with some ease.

Faculty members reported that, in their opinion, administrators have some difficulty in interpreting CIS results (M = 2.70; see Table 27). More than any other faculty group, the assistant professors thought that the CIS results are difficult for administrators to interpret (M = 2.47). About one-fifth of the total faculty thought that administrators find it very difficult to interpret the CIS results.

In general, the faculty also thought that it is difficult for students to interpret CIS results (M = 2.48; see Table 28). Assistant professors (M = 2.27 had the least confidence in the students' ability to interpret the CIS results easily. One-fourth of the faculty thought that students find it very difficult to interpret the CIS results.

Some Alternative Formats

This section of the CIS survey asked the respondents to indicate the desirability of some alternative systems for student evaluations that are in use at other institutions (see Tables 29-42). Half of the faculty thought that a set of forms appropriate to different class types (lecture, discussion, lab) sounded good (M = 4.17; see Table 29). All of the mean faculty ratings were high (over 4.00); they indicated that this alternative was attractive to the faculty. Less than 4% of the faculty indicated that a set of forms appropriate to different class types would not work.

Different forms among the colleges, but consistent within each college, were approved by the faculty (M = 3.41; see Table 30). Such forms sounded better to teaching assistants (M = 3.58), assistant instructors (M = 3.54), and instructors (M = 3.50) than to the remaining faculty ranks.

The faculty was ambivalent about having a "cafeteria" style set of questions from which each instructor could choose a unique set (M = 2.92; see Table 31). Almost one-fourth of the faculty said that this system

Table 2

Item 26. How easy do you think it is for administrators t
currently presented?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
very difficult	1	19 (19.8%)	16 (17.2%)	36 (27.3%)
	2	20 (20.8%)	20 (21.5%)	26 (19.7%)
not sure	3	28 (29.2%)	36 (38.7%)	50 (37.9%)
	4	21 (21.9%)	20 (21.5%)	12 (9.1%)
very easy	5	8 (8.3%)	1 (1.1%)	8 (6.1%)
Total		96 (100.0%)	93 (100.0%)	132 (100.1%)*
Mean		2.78	2.68	2.47
Standard Deviation		1.23	1.03	1.16

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

:7

o interpret the results of the CIS as they are

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
6 (23.1%)	8 (11.0%)	8 (14.5%)	9 (18.4%)	102 (19.5%)
3 (11.5%)	9 (12.3%)	9 (16.4%)	14 (28.6%)	101 (19.3%)
10 (38.5%)	37 (50.7%)	29 (52.7%)	13 (26.5%)	203 (38.7%)
6 (23.1%)	16 (21.9%)	8 (14.5%)	8 (16.3%)	91 (17.4%)
1 (3.8%)	3 (4.1%)	1 (1.8%)	5 (10.2%)	27 (5.2%)
26 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	55 (99.9%)*	49 (100.0%)	524 (100.1%)*
2.73	2.96	2.73	2.71	2.70
1.19	0.98	0.95	1.24	1.12

; error.

Table 2

Item 27. How easy do you think it is for students to inte
presented?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
very difficult	1	26 (27.4%)	17 (18.7%)	46 (34.8%)
	2	15 (15.8%)	25 (27.5%)	28 (21.2%)
not sure	3	38 (40.0%)	35 (38.5%)	39 (29.5%)
	4	14 (14.7%)	13 (14.3%)	14 (10.6%)
very easy	5	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.1%)	5 (3.8%)
Total		95 (100.0%)	91 (100.1%)*	132 (99.9%)*
Mean		2.48	2.52	2.27
Standard Deviation		1.11	0.99	1.16

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

8

rpret the results of the CIS as they are currently

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
8 (30.8%)	14 (19.2%)	7 (13.0%)	11 (22.9%)	129 (24.9%)
1 (3.8%)	16 (21.9%)	11 (20.4%)	12 (25.0%)	108 (20.8%)
10 (38.5%)	32 (43.8%)	29 (53.7%)	18 (37.5%)	201 (38.7%)
5 (19.2%)	9 (12.3%)	5 (9.3%)	5 (10.4%)	65 (12.5%)
2 (7.7%)	2 (2.7%)	2 (3.7%)	2 (4.2%)	16 (3.1%)
26 (100.0%)	73 (99.9%)*	54 (100.1%)*	48 (100.0%)	519 (100.0%)
2.69	2.58	2.70	2.48	2.48
1.32	1.03	0.94	1.09	1.09

error.

-40-

Table 29

Item 28. A set of forms appropriate to different class typ

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
would not work	1	4 (4.2%)	5 (5.6%)	5 (3.9%)
	2	2 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (5.4%)
uncertain	3	21 (21.9%)	20 (22.2%)	22 (17.1%)
	4	28 (29.2%)	27 (30.0%)	33 (25.6%)
sounds good	5	41 (42.7%)	38 (42.2%)	62 (48.1%)
Total		96 (100.1%)*	90 (100.0%)	129 (100.1%)*
Mean		4.04	4.03	4.09
Standard Deviation		1.06	1.08	1.10

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

es (lecture, discussion, lab).

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
1 (3.8%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.1%)	18 (3.5%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (2.1%)
4 (15.4%)	11 (15.7%)	11 (19.3%)	5 (10.2%)	94 (18.2%)
7 (26.9%)	10 (14.3%)	13 (22.8%)	17 (34.7%)	135 (26.1%)
14 (53.8%)	47 (67.1%)	32 (56.1%)	25 (51.0%)	259 (50.1%)
26 (99.9%)*	70 (99.9%)*	57 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)	517 (100.0%)
4.27	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.17
1.00	0.91	0.85	0.96	1.03

error.

Tab

Item 29. Different forms among colleges but consisten

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistan Professo
would not work	1	11 (11.6%)	6 (6.5%)	13 (10.2%
	2	16 (16.8%)	12 (13.0%)	14 (10.9%
uncertain	3	30 (31.6%)	28 (30.4%)	45 (35.2%
	4	19 (20.0%)	24 (26.1%)	27 (21.1%
sounds good	5	19 (20.0%)	22 (23.9%)	29 (22.7%
Total		95 (100.0%)	92 (99.9%)*	128 (100.1%
Mean		3.20	3.48	3.35
Standard Deviation		1.27	1.18	1.23

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roun

le 30

t within a college.

	Rank				Total
nt or	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
)	4 (15.4%)	4 (5.7%)	2 (3.5%)	4 (8.2%)	44 (8.5%)
)	1 (3.8%)	8 (11.4%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (8.2%)	61 (11.8%)
)	6 (23.1%)	23 (32.9%)	21 (36.8%)	18 (36.7%)	171 (33.1%)
)	8 (30.8%)	16 (22.9%)	13 (22.8%)	15 (30.6%)	122 (23.6%)
)	7 (26.9%)	19 (27.1%)	15 (26.3%)	8 (16.3%)	119 (23.0%)
)*	26 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)	57 (99.9%)*	49 (100.0%)	517 (100.0%)
	3.50	3.54	3.58	3.39	3.41
	1.36	1.18	1.10	1.12	1.21

ding error.

Table

Item 30. A "cafeteria" style set of questions from whic

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
would not work	1	27 (29.3%)	23 (25.8%)	34 (26.6%)
	2	16 (17.4%)	9 (10.1%)	17 (13.3%)
uncertain	3	24 (26.1%)	24 (27.0%)	25 (19.5%)
	4	11 (12.0%)	15 (16.9%)	24 (18.8%)
sounds good	5	14 (15.2%)	18 (20.2%)	28 (21.9%)
Total		92 (100.0%)	89 (100.0%)	128 (100.1%)*
Mean		2.66	2.96	2.96
Standard Deviation		1.41	1.46	1.51

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

31

each instructor can choose a unique set.

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	7 (26.9%)	15 (21.4%)	10 (17.5%)	7 (14.6%)	123 (24.1%)
	2 (7.7%)	10 (14.3%)	9 (15.8%)	13 (27.1%)	76 (14.9%)
	6 (23.1%)	19 (27.1%)	21 (36.8%)	10 (20.8%)	129 (25.3%)
	5 (19.2%)	12 (17.1%)	7 (12.3%)	8 (16.7%)	82 (16.1%)
	6 (23.1%)	14 (20.0%)	10 (17.5%)	10 (20.8%)	100 (19.6%)
	26 (100.0%)	70 (99.9%)*	57 (99.9%)*	48 (100.0%)	510 (100.0%)
	3.04	3.00	2.97	3.02	2.92
	1.54	1.41	1.31	1.38	1.43

g error.

-43-

would not work here at U.T. Austin. Professors (M = 2.66) were the most negative about having a "cafeteria" style set of questions.

The faculty indicated a set of "global" items common to all questionnaires for comparison, plus a separate "pick your own" section tailored to the individual course, might work (M = 3.65; see Table 32). Indicating that they were relatively positive about this alternative system, each faculty group had an item mean above 3.50.

Next, the faculty rated the desirability of a questionnaire with three separate sections--one with global evaluative items, one with items for specific feedback on teaching, and one with information for prospective students (see Table 33). The faculty was slightly positive that a questionnaire with three separate sections would work (M = 3.44). Teaching assistant (M = 3.72) and assistant instructors (M = 3.69) were the most positive about this alternative.

The faculty then rated the desirability of a questionnaire with a second set of three separate sections--one with global evaluative items, one with items on teaching method, and one with items dealing with course content (see Table 34). All ranks were rather positive about the chances of this alternative system working here at U.T. Austin (M = 3.80 for the total group). Assistant instructors (M = 4.10) and instructors (M = 3.96) were the most positive, while professors (M = 3.55) were the least positive about the likelihood that these separate sections would work.

The next item asked the respondents to indicate how many items they thought should be on the CIS questionnaire (see Table 35). Two-fifths of the faculty (40.8%) thought there should be 20-29 items on the CIS questionnaire. The next most frequently chosen response (29.3% of the total faculty) was 10-19 items. Less than 20% of the faculty thought that there should be more than 30 items.

The respondents were asked how likely they would be to use an evaluation, on a regular basis, partway through the semester for diagnostic feedback (see Table 36). The faculty (M = 3.30) indicated that they might use

Table 32

Item 31. A set of "global" items common to all questionnai
section tailored to the individual course.

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	I
would not work	1	8 (8.4%)	10 (11.1%)	7 (5.4%)	
	2	12 (12.6%)	7 (7.8%)	16 (12.4%)	
uncertain	3	25 (26.3%)	21 (23.3%)	26 (20.2%)	
	4	21 (22.1%)	27 (30.0%)	37 (28.7%)	
sounds good	5	29 (30.5%)	25 (27.8%)	43 (33.3%)	
Total		95 (99.9%)*	90 (100.0%)	129 (100.0%)	
Mean		3.54	3.56	3.72	
Standard Deviation		1.28	1.28	1.21	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

res for comparison, plus a separate "pick your own"

Rank				Total
nstructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	5 (7.1%)	2 (3.5%)	2 (4.1%)	36 (7.0%)
2 (8.0%)	9 (12.9%)	6 (10.5%)	7 (14.3%)	59 (11.5%)
5 (20.0%)	10 (14.3%)	18 (31.6%)	12 (24.5%)	117 (22.7%)
9 (36.0%)	21 (30.0%)	13 (22.8%)	15 (30.6%)	143 (27.8%)
7 (28.0%)	25 (35.7%)	18 (31.6%)	13 (26.5%)	160 (31.1%)
25 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)	515 (100.1%)*
3.68	3.74	3.68	3.61	3.65
1.22	1.27	1.14	1.15	1.23

error.

Table 33

Item 32. A questionnaire with three separate sections - one w
specific feedback on teaching, and one with informat

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	R Inst
would not work	1	9 (9.5%)	6 (6.7%)	17 (13.4%)	(2
	2	19 (20.0%)	9 (10.0%)	11 (8.7%)	(0
uncertain	3	24 (25.3%)	38 (42.2%)	39 (30.7%)	(2
	4	24 (25.3%)	15 (16.7%)	19 (15.0%)	(3
sounds good	5	19 (20.0%)	22 (24.4%)	41 (32.3%)	(2
Total		95 (100.1%)*	90 (100.0%)	127 (100.1%)*	(1
Mean		3.26	3.42	3.44	
Standard Deviation		1.26	1.16	1.37	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding err

ith global evaluative items, one with items for
ion for prospective students.

ank				Total
tructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
5 0.0%)	3 (4.3%)	3 (5.3%)	5 (10.2%)	48 (9.4%)
0 .0%)	6 (8.6%)	1 (1.8%)	8 (16.3%)	54 (10.5%)
6 4.0%)	23 (32.9%)	19 (33.3%)	19 (38.8%)	168 (32.7%)
9 6.0%)	16 (22.9%)	20 (35.1%)	6 (12.2%)	109 (21.2%)
5 0.0%)	22 (31.4%)	14 (24.6%)	11 (22.4%)	134 (26.1%)
25 C0.0%)	70 (100.1%)*	57 (100.1%)*	49 (99.9%)*	513 (99.9%)*
3.36	3.69	3.72	3.20	3.44
1.38	1.14	1.03	1.26	1.24

or.

Table 34

Item 33. A questionnaire with three separate sections - one teaching method, and one with items dealing with t

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	I
would not work	1	14 (14.7%)	4 (4.4%)	7 (5.5%)	
	2	7 (7.4%)	6 (6.7%)	16 (12.6%)	
uncertain	3	13 (13.7%)	22 (24.4%)	24 (18.9%)	
	4	35 (36.8%)	32 (35.6%)	35 (27.6%)	
sounds good	5	26 (27.4%)	26 (28.9%)	45 (35.4%)	
Total		95 (100.0%)	90 (100.0%)	127 (100.0%)	
Mean		3.55	3.78	3.75	
Standard Deviation		1.36	1.08	1.22	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding e

with global evaluative items, one with items on
he course content.

Rank				Total
nstructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
0 (0.0%)	2 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.3%)	30 (5.9%)
3 (12.0%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.5%)	4 (8.3%)	39 (7.6%)
5 (20.0%)	17 (24.3%)	21 (36.8%)	6 (12.5%)	108 (21.1%)
7 (28.0%)	18 (25.7%)	19 (33.3%)	17 (35.4%)	163 (31.8%)
10 (40.0%)	32 (45.7%)	15 (26.3%)	18 (37.5%)	172 (33.6%)
25 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)	57 (99.9%)*	48 (100.0%)	512 (100.0%)
3.96	4.10	3.83	3.90	3.80
1.06	1.01	0.87	1.19	1.16

rror.

Table

Item 34. How many items do you think should be on the CI

Response	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
less than 10	19 (20.2%)	14 (15.7%)	23 (18.9%)
10-19	31 (33.0%)	27 (30.3%)	35 (28.7%)
20-29	32 (34.0%)	32 (36.0%)	50 (41.0%)
30-39	9 (9.6%)	12 (13.5%)	9 (7.4%)
40+	3 (3.2%)	4 (4.5%)	5 (4.1%)
Total	94 (100.0%)	89 (100.0%)	122 (100.1%)*

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

35

S questionnaire?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
0 (0.0%)	2 (2.9%)	1 (1.8%)	6 (12.5%)	65 (12.9%)
9 (36.0%)	19 (27.1%)	14 (24.6%)	13 (27.1%)	148 (29.3%)
13 (52.0%)	30 (42.9%)	28 (49.1%)	21 (43.8%)	206 (40.8%)
2 (8.0%)	17 (24.3%)	6 (10.5%)	6 (12.5%)	61 (12.1%)
1 (4.0%)	2 (2.9%)	8 (14.0%)	2 (4.2%)	25 (5.0%)
25 (100.0%)	70 (100.1%)*	57 (100.0%)	48 (100.1%)*	505 (100.1%)*

g error.

Table 3

Item 35. Recent CTE studies indicate a potential usefulne
semester for diagnostic feedback. If such a sys
you be to use it on a regular basis?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
very unlikely	1	30 (30.9%)	20 (21.5%)	35 (26.9%)
	2	8 (8.2%)	14 (15.1%)	12 (9.2%)
not sure	3	13 (13.4%)	13 (14.0%)	14 (10.8%)
	4	23 (23.7%)	18 (19.4%)	25 (19.2%)
very likely	5	23 (23.7%)	28 (30.1%)	44 (33.8%)
Total		97 (99.9%)*	93 (100.1%)*	130 (99.9%)*
Mean		3.01	3.22	3.24
Standard Deviation		1.59	1.55	1.64

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

...ss of having an evaluation partway through the ...tem were readily available, how likely would

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (7.7%)	16 (22.5%)	5 (8.8%)	8 (16.0%)	116 (22.1%)
5 (19.2%)	6 (8.5%)	3 (5.3%)	6 (12.0%)	54 (10.3%)
2 (7.7%)	12 (16.9%)	12 (21.1%)	8 (16.0%)	74 (14.1%)
6 (23.1%)	16 (22.5%)	15 (26.3%)	12 (24.0%)	115 (21.9%)
11 (42.3%)	21 (29.6%)	22 (38.6%)	16 (32.0%)	165 (31.5%)
26 (100.0%)	71 (100.0%)	57 (100.1%)*	50 (100.0%)	524 (99.9%)*
3.73	3.28	3.81	3.44	3.30
1.40	1.53	1.26	1.46	1.54

error.

an evaluation partway through the semester. Teaching assistants (M = 3.81) and instructors (M = 3.73) were the most likely and professors (M = 3.01) the least likely to use a midsemester evaluation.

The next six items asked the respondents whether or not student evaluations should be made mandatory for certain groups of the faculty (see Tables 37-42). No separate data were collected for the faculty category of instructor; it was included in the category of "other" ranks.

Approximately 40% of the faculty thought that student evaluations should be required every semester of full professors (see Table 37). About 24% of the faculty thought evaluations should be required of this group once a year, 23% thought it should be optional only, never required, and 12% thought it should be required once every 2 to 5 years. Almost none of the faculty (1.7%) thought it should be required at critical decision points. By faculty rank, more than half (each) of the instructors, assistant instructors, and teaching assistants thought that evaluations should be required of full professors every semester; approximately 40% (each) of the associate and assistant professors, but less than 25% of the full professors, thought that evaluations should be required of full professors every semester.

More than 40% of the faculty agreed that student evaluations should be required every semester of associate professors (see Table 38). About one-fourth indicated evaluations should be required once a year, and one-fifth thought that the evaluations should be optional only. The most frequently chosen response of each faculty group except professors was to require evaluations of associate professors every semester; the choice most preferred by the full professors (29.5%) was that such evaluations be optional only.

A majority (51.2%) of the faculty indicated that evaluations should be required every semester of assistant professors (see Table 39). One-fifth of the faculty thought these evaluations should be required yearly, while another one-fifth chose optional only. Few of the faculty thought evaluations

Table

Item 36. Should student evaluations be made mandatory fo

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
optional only, never required	1	36 (37.9%)	21 (22.8%)	36 (27.5%)
required once every 2-5 years	2	18 (18.9%)	13 (14.1%)	12 (9.2%)
required at critical decision points	3	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.3%)
required once per year	4	19 (20.0%)	21 (22.8%)	25 (19.1%)
required every semester	5	22 (23.2%)	37 (40.2%)	55 (42.0%)
Total		95 (100.0%)	92 (99.9%)*	131 (100.1%)*
Mean		2.72	3.44	3.39
Standard Deviation		1.67	1.65	1.71

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

37

or Full Professors?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	8 (11.0%)	6 (10.5%)	10 (19.6%)	119 (22.7%)
3 (12.0%)	6 (8.2%)	3 (5.3%)	7 (13.7%)	62 (11.8%)
0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	4 (7.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)
7 (28.0%)	20 (27.4%)	15 (26.3%)	17 (33.3%)	124 (23.7%)
13 (52.0%)	37 (50.7%)	29 (50.9%)	17 (33.3%)	210 (40.1%)
25 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	51 (99.9%)*	524 (100.0%)
4.04	3.99	4.02	3.47	3.47
1.34	1.37	1.33	1.55	1.63

g error.

-51-

Table 38

Item 37. Should student evaluations be made mandatory for

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	I
optional only, never required	1	28 (29.5%)	17 (18.5%)	35 (26.7%)	
required once every 2-5 years	2	15 (15.8%)	11 (12.0%)	7 (5.3%)	
required at critical decision points	3	8 (8.4%)	3 (3.3%)	6 (4.6%)	
required once per year	4	21 (22.1%)	24 (26.1%)	30 (22.9%)	
required every semester	5	23 (24.2%)	37 (40.2%)	53 (40.5%)	
Total		95 (100.0%)	92 (100.1%)*	131 (100.0%)	
Mean		2.96	3.58	3.45	
Standard Deviation		1.60	1.56	1.67	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

ssociate Professors?

Rank				Total
nstructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	7 (9.6%)	6 (10.5%)	10 (19.6%)	105 (20.0%)
3 (12.0%)	4 (5.5%)	2 (3.5%)	6 (11.8%)	48 (9.2%)
0 (0.0%)	4 (5.5%)	4 (7.0%)	1 (2.0%)	26 (5.0%)
7 (28.0%)	14 (19.2%)	15 (26.3%)	17 (33.3%)	128 (24.4%)
13 (52.0%)	44 (60.3%)	30 (52.6%)	17 (33.3%)	217 (41.4%)
25 (100.0%)	73 (100.1%)*	57 (99.9%)*	51 (100.0%)	524 (100.0%)
4.04	4.15	4.07	3.49	3.58
1.34	1.32	1.31	1.54	1.57

error.

Table 3

Item 38. Should student evaluations be made mandatory for

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
optional only, never required	1	25 (26.3%)	16 (17.4%)	37 (28.0%)
required once every 2-5 years	2	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (2.3%)
required at critical decision points	3	5 (5.3%)	4 (4.3%)	3 (2.3%)
required once per year	4	24 (25.3%)	19 (20.7%)	25 (18.9%)
required every semester	5	40 (42.1%)	50 (54.3%)	64 (48.5%)
Total		95 (100.1%)*	92 (100.0%)	132 (100.0%)
Mean		3.56	3.91	3.58
Standard Deviation		1.65	1.52	1.72

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

Assistant Professors?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	7 (9.6%)	6 (10.5%)	9 (17.6%)	102 (19.4%)
2 (8.0%)	3 (4.1%)	1 (1.8%)	3 (5.9%)	16 (3.0%)
0 (0.0%)	6 (8.2%)	3 (5.3%)	3 (5.9%)	24 (4.6%)
7 (28.0%)	7 (9.6%)	15 (26.3%)	17 (33.3%)	114 (21.7%)
14 (56.0%)	50 (68.5%)	32 (56.1%)	19 (37.3%)	269 (51.2%)
25 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	525 (99.9%)*
4.16	4.23	4.16	3.67	3.82
1.28	1.33	1.28	1.48	1.55

error.

should be required of assistant professors at critical decision points (4.6%) or once every 2 to 5 years (3.0%).

More than 60% of the faculty thought evaluations should be required every semester of assistant instructors (see Table 40). Almost one-fifth of the faculty preferred that evaluations should be optional; slightly more than 10% indicated that they should be required annually. Few of the faculty thought evaluations should be required at critical decision points (2.5%) or once every 2 to 5 years (1.3%) for assistant instructors.

Likewise, over 60% of the faculty agreed that evaluations should be required every semester of teaching assistants (see Table 41). One-fifth of the faculty indicated evaluations should be optional only and less than 15% indicated evaluations should be required yearly. Very few of the respondents thought evaluations should be required at critical decision points (2.1%) or once every 2 to 5 years (1.1%) for teaching assistants.

Half the faculty indicated that evaluations should be required every semester for other non-tenure appointments (see Table 42). One-fourth of the faculty indicated that evaluations should be optional only, and less than one-fifth indicated that evaluations should be required once per year. Very few of the faculty indicated that evaluations should be required at critical decision points (4.0%) or once every 2 to 5 years (2.1%) for other non-tenure appointments.

Background Data

The remaining multiple-choice items on the CIS questionnaire asked the respondents to give some background information about themselves (see Tables 43-50).

Two-thirds of the faculty indicated that they always participate in the CIS (see Table 43), fewer than 4% indicated that they seldom or never participate in the CIS. The item means show that assistant professors (M = 4.88) and other faculty (M = 4.82) participate in the CIS the most frequently, while professors (M = 4.19) and teaching assistants (M = 4.19) use it the least.

Table 40

Item 29. Should student evaluations be made mandatory for A

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	I
optional only, never required	1	23 (24.5%)	15 (16.5%)	33 (25.0%)	
required once every 2-5 years	2	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (2.3%)	
required at critical decision points	3	3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (2.3%)	
required once per year	4	11 (11.7%)	12 (13.2%)	16 (12.1%)	
required every semester	5	57 (60.6%)	62 (68.1%)	77 (58.3%)	
Total		94 (100.0%)	91 (100.0%)	132 (100.0%)	
Mean		3.84	4.15	3.77	
Standard Deviation		1.69	1.49	1.71	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

Assistant Instructors?

Rank				Total
nstructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	8 (11.0%)	6 (10.5%)	9 (17.6%)	96 (18.4%)
1 (4.0%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.3%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	3 (5.3%)	2 (3.9%)	13 (2.5%)
4 (16.0%)	10 (13.7%)	9 (15.8%)	10 (19.6%)	72 (13.8%)
18 (72.0%)	53 (72.6%)	38 (66.7%)	30 (58.8%)	335 (64.1%)
25 (100.0%)	73 (100.1%)*	57 (100.1%)*	51 (99.9%)*	523 (100.1%)*
4.40	4.36	4.26	4.02	4.04
1.23	1.30	1.30	1.50	1.54

error.

Table 4

Item 40. Should student evaluations be made mandatory for

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
optional only, never required	1	26 (27.7%)	16 (17.6%)	36 (27.3%)
required once every 2-5 years	2	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (1.5%)
required at critical decision points	3	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (3.0%)
required once per year	4	12 (12.8%)	7 (7.7%)	14 (10.6%)
required every semester	5	54 (57.4%)	66 (72.5%)	76 (57.6%)
Total		94 (100.0%)	91 (100.0%)	132 (100.0%)
Mean		3.72	4.17	3.70
Standard Deviation		1.74	1.54	1.75

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

1

Teaching Assistants?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.0%)	8 (11.0%)	8 (14.0%)	8 (15.7%)	104 (19.9%)
1 (4.0%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.8%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.1%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.5%)	1 (2.0%)	11 (2.1%)
4 (16.0%)	7 (9.6%)	9 (15.8%)	12 (23.5%)	65 (12.4%)
18 (72.0%)	56 (76.7%)	37 (64.9%)	30 (58.8%)	337 (64.4%)
25 (100.0%)	73 (100.1%)*	57 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	523 (99.9%)*
4.40	4.39	4.16	4.10	4.00
1.23	1.30	1.42	1.43	1.58

g error.

Table 4

Item 41. Should student evaluations be made mandatory for

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
optional only, never required	1	31 (32.6%)	22 (24.2%)	44 (33.6%)
required once every 2-5 years	2	2 (2.1%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (2.3%)
required at critical decision points	3	5 (5.3%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (1.5%)
required once per year	4	20 (21.1%)	16 (17.6%)	20 (15.3%)
required every semester	5	37 (38.9%)	47 (51.6%)	62 (47.3%)
Total		95 (100.0%)	91 (100.0%)	131 (100.0%)
Mean		3.32	3.69	3.41
Standard Deviation		1.74	1.67	1.81

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

other non-tenure appointments?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.3%)	14 (19.4%)	8 (14.0%)	10 (19.6%)	131 (25.1%)
2 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	11 (2.1%)
0 (0.0%)	3 (4.2%)	6 (10.5%)	2 (3.9%)	21 (4.0%)
5 (20.8%)	7 (9.7%)	10 (17.5%)	18 (35.3%)	96 (18.4%)
15 (62.5%)	48 (66.7%)	33 (57.9%)	20 (39.2%)	262 (50.3%)
24 (99.9%)*	72 (100.0%)	57 (99.9%)*	51 (100.0%)	521 (99.9%)*
4.21	4.04	4.05	3.73	3.67
1.32	1.58	1.41	1.50	1.67

error.

Table 4

Item 42. How often do you participate in the CIS?

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
seldom	2	6 (5.9%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)
occasionally	3	14 (13.7%)	6 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)
frequently	4	33 (32.4%)	36 (37.9%)	16 (12.0%)
always	5	48 (47.1%)	50 (52.6%)	117 (88.0%)
Total		102 (100.1%)*	95 (100.0%)	133 (100.0%)
Mean		4.19	4.39	4.88
Standard Deviation		0.95	0.79	0.33

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.7%)
1 (3.7%)	2 (2.7%)	5 (8.8%)	0 (0.0%)	16 (3.0%)
1 (3.7%)	3 (4.1%)	6 (10.5%)	2 (3.9%)	32 (5.9%)
6 (22.2%)	14 (19.2%)	11 (19.3%)	5 (9.8%)	121 (22.5%)
19 (70.4%)	54 (74.0%)	33 (57.9%)	44 (86.3%)	365 (67.8%)
27 (100.0%)	73 (100.0%)	57 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	538 (99.9%)*
4.59	4.64	4.19	4.82	4.54
0.75	0.70	1.16	0.48	0.80

error.

Nearly 60% of the faculty members frequently or always use CIS results for improvement in general teaching skills (see Table 44). About 16% seldom or never use the results for this purpose. Assistant instructors (M = 3.99), instructors (M = 3.85), and other faculty (M = 3.75) use the results more frequently for improvement in general teaching skills than do professors (M = 3.37), who use it the least.

More than half of the faculty members frequently or always use the CIS results--fewer than one-fifth seldom or never use them--for specific course improvement (see Table 45). Assistant instructors (M = 3.76), instructors (M = 3.67), assistant professors (M = 3.61), and other faculty (M = 3.61) use the CIS results the most frequently for this purpose, while teaching assistants (M = 3.11) use them the least.

Fewer than 15% of the faculty members use CIS results frequently or always as information for students in their selection of classes (see Table 46). More than 60% seldom or never use the CIS results for this purpose. What these numbers indicate is that faculty members rarely release their CIS results to be published in the Student Guide to Courses and Instructors, the summary of CIS results that students can use in selecting courses. Instructors (M = 2.23), assistant professors (M = 1.96), and associate professors (M = 1.93) use the CIS results more frequently for information for students in their class selection than do assistant instructors (M = 1.72), professors (M = 1.82), or teaching assistants (M = 1.82).

Half of the faculty frequently or always uses CIS results as information for administrators in annual reviews (see Table 47). More than one-third seldom or never uses the CIS results for this purpose. Assistant professors (M = 4.09), instructors (M = 3.52), and associate professors (M = 3.43) submit CIS results to administrators more frequently than do teaching assistants (M = 1.55) and assistant instructors (M = 2.28).

Half of the faculty frequently or always uses CIS results as information for promotion and tenure reviews (see Table 48). More than one-third

Table 44

Item 43. How often do you use the CIS results for improvem

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	8 (8.1%)	8 (8.4%)	7 (5.3%)
seldom	2	12 (12.1%)	8 (8.4%)	17 (12.8%)
occasionally	3	30 (30.3%)	24 (25.3%)	36 (27.1%)
frequently	4	33 (33.3%)	37 (38.9%)	46 (34.6%)
always	5	16 (16.2%)	18 (18.9%)	27 (20.3%)
Total		99 (100.0%)	95 (99.9%)*	133 (100.1%)*
Mean		3.37	3.52	3.52
Standard Deviation		1.14	1.15	1.11

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

ent in general teaching skills?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (7.4%)	1 (1.4%)	6 (11.1%)	2 (3.9%)	34 (6.4%)
1 (3.7%)	1 (1.4%)	5 (9.3%)	5 (9.8%)	49 (9.2%)
4 (14.8%)	18 (25.0%)	8 (14.8%)	12 (23.5%)	132 (24.9%)
12 (44.4%)	30 (41.7%)	20 (37.0%)	17 (33.3%)	195 (36.7%)
8 (29.6%)	22 (30.6%)	15 (27.8%)	15 (29.4%)	121 (22.8%)
27 (99.9%)*	72 (100.1%)*	54 (100.0%)	51 (99.9%)*	531 (100.0%)
3.85	3.99	3.61	3.75	3.60
1.13	0.86	1.30	1.11	1.13

error.

Table

Item 44. How often do you use the CIS results for specif

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	7 (7.1%)	10 (10.6%)	7 (5.3%)
seldom	2	7 (7.1%)	12 (12.8%)	13 (9.8%)
occasionally	3	34 (34.3%)	20 (21.3%)	34 (25.6%)
frequently	4	35 (35.4%)	35 (37.2%)	50 (37.6%)
always	5	16 (16.2%)	17 (18.1%)	29 (21.8%)
Total		99 (100.1%)*	94 (100.0%)	133 (100.1%)*
Mean		3.47	3.39	3.61
Standard Deviation		1.07	1.23	1.09

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundi

fic course improvement?

	Rank				Total
	Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
	1 (3.7%)	1 (1.4%)	9 (17.0%)	4 (7.8%)	39 (7.4%)
	4 (14.8%)	3 (4.2%)	8 (15.1%)	3 (5.9%)	50 (9.5%)
	5 (18.5%)	24 (33.8%)	12 (22.6%)	15 (29.4%)	144 (27.3%)
	10 (37.0%)	27 (38.0%)	16 (30.2%)	16 (31.4%)	189 (35.8%)
	7 (25.9%)	16 (22.5%)	8 (15.1%)	13 (25.5%)	106 (20.1%)
	27 (99.9%)*	71 (99.9%)*	53 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)	528 (100.1%)*
	3.67	3.76	3.11	3.61	3.52
	1.14	0.90	1.33	1.17	1.13

ng error.

Table 46

Item 45. How often do you use the CIS results for informat

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	56 (56.0%)	53 (56.4%)	74 (57.4%)
seldom	2	19 (19.0%)	16 (17.0%)	22 (17.1%)
occasionally	3	16 (16.0%)	12 (12.8%)	10 (7.8%)
frequently	4	5 (5.0%)	5 (5.3%)	10 (7.8%)
always	5	4 (4.0%)	8 (8.5%)	13 (10.1%)
Total		100 (100.0%)	94 (100.0%)	129 (100.2%)*
Mean		1.82	1.93	1.96
Standard Deviation		1.12	1.30	1.37

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

ion for students in their class selection?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
11 (42.3%)	43 (63.2%)	29 (58.0%)	26 (56.5%)	292 (56.9%)
6 (23.1%)	12 (17.6%)	10 (20.0%)	7 (15.2%)	92 (17.9%)
3 (11.5%)	6 (8.8%)	4 (8.0%)	7 (15.2%)	58 (11.3%)
4 (15.4%)	3 (4.4%)	5 (10.0%)	4 (8.7%)	36 (7.0%)
2 (7.7%)	4 (5.9%)	2 (4.0%)	2 (4.3%)	35 (6.8%)
26 (100.0%)	68 (99.9%)*	50 (100.0%)	46 (99.9%)*	513 (99.9%)*
2.23	1.72	1.82	1.89	1.89
1.37	1.17	1.19	1.22	1.25

error.

Table

Item 46. How often do you use the CIS results for inform

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	20 (20.0%)	16 (17.2%)	11 (8.7%)
seldom	2	16 (16.0%)	8 (8.6%)	7 (5.5%)
occasionally	3	18 (18.0%)	18 (19.4%)	10 (7.9%)
frequently	4	22 (22.0%)	22 (23.7%)	30 (23.6%)
always	5	24 (24.0%)	29 (31.2%)	69 (54.3%)
Total		100 (100.0%)	93 (100.1%)*	127 (100.0%)
Mean		3.14	3.43	4.09
Standard Deviation		1.46	1.45	1.28

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of roundin

47

ation for administrators in annual reviews?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
5 (18.5%)	32 (53.3%)	32 (68.1%)	14 (30.4%)	130 (26.0%)
3 (11.1%)	6 (10.0%)	7 (14.9%)	2 (4.3%)	49 (9.8%)
3 (11.1%)	7 (11.7%)	5 (10.6%)	6 (13.0%)	67 (13.4%)
5 (18.5%)	3 (5.0%)	3 (6.4%)	9 (19.6%)	94 (18.8%)
11 (40.7%)	12 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (32.6%)	160 (32.0%)
27 (99.9%)*	60 (100.0%)	47 (100.0%)	46 (99.9%)*	500 (100.0%)
3.52	2.28	1.55	3.20	3.21
1.58	1.62	0.93	1.67	1.60

g error.

-63-

Table 4

Item 47. How often do you use the CIS results for informa

Response		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
never	1	22 (22.2%)	12 (12.8%)	11 (9.0%)
seldom	2	15 (15.2%)	6 (6.4%)	3 (2.5%)
occasionally	3	16 (16.2%)	21 (22.3%)	10 (8.2%)
frequently	4	17 (17.2%)	19 (20.2%)	25 (20.5%)
always	5	29 (29.3%)	36 (38.3%)	73 (59.8%)
Total		99 (100.1%)*	94 (100.0%)	122 (100.0%)
Mean		3.16	3.65	4.20
Standard Deviation		1.54	1.38	1.25

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

3

tion for promotion and tenure reviews?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
10 (40.0%)	37 (62.7%)	35 (76.1%)	17 (41.5%)	144 (29.6%)
3 (12.0%)	2 (3.4%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.9%)	35 (7.2%)
2 (8.0%)	3 (5.1%)	4 (8.7%)	9 (22.0%)	65 (13.4%)
3 (12.0%)	4 (6.8%)	2 (4.3%)	3 (7.3%)	73 (15.0%)
7 (28.0%)	13 (22.0%)	1 (2.2%)	10 (24.4%)	169 (34.8%)
25 (100.0%)	59 (100.0%)	46 (100.0%)	41 (100.1%)*	486 (100.0%)
2.76	2.22	1.48	2.68	3.18
1.74	1.71	0.98	1.65	1.67

error.

-164-

seldom or never use the CIS results for this purpose. Assistant professors (M = 4.20), associate professors (M = 3.65), and professors (M = 3.16) use the CIS results more frequently for promotion and tenure reviews than do teaching assistants (M = 1.48) and assistant instructors (M = 2.22).

The next set of items asked about the number of undergraduate and graduate courses usually taught by faculty members at the various ranks (see Tables 49 and 50). On the average, faculty members participating in the survey teach three undergraduate courses per year (see Table 49). Instructors (M = 4.04) and "other" faculty ranks (M = 3.57) teach the most undergraduate courses per year. Teaching assistants (M = 2.37) and professors (M = 2.91) teach the fewest.

As a whole, the faculty respondents to the survey teach an average of almost two graduate courses per year (M = 1.82; see Table 50). The "other" faculty (M = 2.10), professors (M = 1.90), and assistant professors (M = 1.80) teach the most graduate courses per year, while teaching assistants (M = 1.00) and instructors (M = 1.60) teach the fewest graduate courses per year.

Free-Response Items

The last section of the questionnaire contained three free-response items. The free-response items asked the respondents to indicate their likes and dislikes about the current CIS program and to indicate what changes would make the current CIS program more useful. A total of 371 faculty wrote comments on the free-response items on the survey. For each item, faculty responses were summarized by grouping similar responses together. On the basis of these groupings, a set of content categories was derived, and frequencies per category were tallied to summarize these free-response data in a manner that was concise, as well as one that would facilitate interpretation. The percentage of faculty members who answered an item and gave a particular response was calculated.

The first free-response item asked the faculty to indicate the two

Table 49

Item 50. How many undergraduate courses do you usually teach

Response	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	In
1	11 (12.2%)	9 (10.1%)	14 (11.2%)	
2	29 (32.2%)	17 (19.1%)	29 (23.2%)	
3	24 (26.7%)	31 (34.8%)	37 (29.6%)	
4	16 (17.8%)	19 (21.3%)	24 (19.2%)	
5	3 (3.3%)	8 (9.0%)	10 (8.0%)	
6	7 (7.8%)	5 (5.6%)	11 (8.8%)	
Total	90 (100.0%)	89 (99.9%)*	125 (100.0%)	(
Mean	2.91	3.17	3.16	
Standard Deviation	1.36	1.29	1.41	

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding e

per year?

Rank				Total
structor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (8.7%)	9 (12.7%)	20 (37.0%)	4 (9.5%)	69 (14.0%)
4 (17.4%)	18 (25.4%)	18 (33.3%)	7 (16.7%)	122 (24.7%)
2 (8.7%)	13 (18.3%)	4 (7.4%)	10 (23.8%)	121 (24.5%)
5 (21.7%)	19 (26.8%)	5 (9.3%)	10 (23.8%)	98 (19.8%)
3 (13.0%)	11 (15.5%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (9.5%)	41 (8.3%)
7 (30.4%)	1 (1.4%)	5 (9.3%)	7 (16.7%)	43 (8.7%)
23 (99.9%)*	71 (100.1%)*	54 (100.0%)	42 (100.0%)	494 (100.0%)
4.04	3.11	2.37	3.57	3.10
1.75	1.34	1.59	1.55	1.45

rror.

Table 5

Item 51. How many graduate courses do you usually teach p

Response	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
1	36 (40.0%)	44 (52.4%)	54 (50.9%)
2	40 (44.4%)	26 (31.0%)	33 (31.1%)
3	6 (6.7%)	8 (9.5%)	9 (8.5%)
4	5 (5.6%)	3 (3.6%)	7 (6.6%)
5	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.4%)	2 (1.9%)
6	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (0.9%)
Total	90 (100.0%)	84 (100.1%)*	106 (99.9%)*
Mean	1.90	1.76	1.80
Standard Deviation	1.07	1.06	1.07

* This figure differs from 100.0% only because of rounding

0

er year?

Rank				Total
Instructor	Assistant Instructor	Teaching Assistant	Other	
2 (40.0%)	6 (66.7%)	1 (100.0%)	4 (40.0%)	147 (48.2%)
3 (60.0%)	2 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (40.0%)	108 (35.4%)
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	23 (7.5%)
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	16 (5.2%)
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	6 (2.0%)
0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (1.6%)
5 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	10 (100.0%)	305 (99.9%)*
1.60	1.78	1.00	2.10	1.82
.55	1.64	0.00	1.37	1.09

error.

-67-

or three things about the current CIS program that they really like (see Table 51). Three things about the current CIS program that were most liked by the faculty were the students' written comments, their indications of teaching quality/suggestions for improvement, and the opportunity for students to say things about the courses and instructors without fear of reprisal. Other frequently listed comments included the ease of its administration and its availability. Some valued the CIS results because they provide comparisons among classes and colleagues.

The second free-response item asked the faculty to indicate what changes could be made in the current CIS program to make it more useful to them (see Table 52). The four changes suggested most often were to compare only similar courses, ranks, etc.; to have written answers (only) to fewer questions; to discard erroneous statistical treatments (e.g., percentile comparisons); and to differentiate ratings of materials and learning from teacher ratings.

The last free-response item asked the faculty to indicate the two or three things about the current CIS program that they really dislike (see Table 53). Four things about the current CIS program that the faculty most disliked were the percentile rankings, the fact that CIS results are used to make administrative decisions, the treatment of different types of courses as if they were the same, and the fact that not everyone is evaluated.

Discussion

The results indicated that the majority of the faculty who responded to the survey believes that the CIS system as it currently exists should be retained with minor revisions. Approximately one-fourth believes the CIS should be retained but needs major revisions. Overall, the faculty rated the majority of the component parts of the CIS as useful. The faculty indicated that the most useful components of the CIS and the printout of results were the written comments, the frequency of students choosing each response, and the average score on each item. The least useful components

Table 51

Free-response Item 1. What are two or three things about the current CIS program that you really like?

Response	N	%
--Students' written comments	137	45.1
--Useful to indicate where teaching can be improved and gives some indication of quality of instruction	67	22.0
--Gives students an opportunity to say things about the courses and instructors without fear of reprisal	40	13.2
--Ease of administration	35	11.5
--That it is available	33	10.9
--Standardized - allows comparisons among classes and with colleagues	29	9.5
--Information provided with results is useful	26	8.6
--Forces me to look at myself as an instructor	17	5.5
--Disclosure of results is voluntary	9	3.0
--Promptness of results	8	2.6
--Availability of different forms	7	2.3
--Regularity	6	2.0
--Provides input into faculty evaluation procedure	4	1.3
--Everything	3	1.0
--Questions dealing with instructor's habits, mannerisms, etc.	2	0.7
--Positive attitude that it promotes toward good teaching	2	0.7
--Not handled by college or department	2	0.7
--Analysis that helps me interpret the results	2	0.7
--That it is optional	1	0.3

Table 32

Free-response Item 2. What changes could be made in the current CIS program to make it more useful to you?

Response	N	%
--Compare only similar courses, ranks, etc.	60	19.8
--Have only written answers to fewer questions	52	17.2
--Discard erroneous statistical treatments (i.e., percentile comparisons)	48	15.8
--Differentiate materials and learning from teacher ratings.	40	13.2
--Every course and every instructor should be evaluated	23	7.6
--Add a midsemester diagnostic evaluation	21	6.9
--Get results before the beginning of the new semester	20	6.6
--Have more background data on the students to be used in correlations (i.e., expected grade, classification, etc.)	20	6.6
--Shorten the survey	20	6.6
--Educate administrators to use it more wisely	19	6.3
--Abolish it	10	3.3
--Like it the way it is	9	3.0
--Should have "exit surveys" to get students' reflective comments	8	2.6
--Give CIS a complete overhaul	6	2.0
--Improve the validity and reliability of questions	5	1.7
--Have departments administer it	4	1.3
--Add "not applicable" category	4	1.3
--Make students more aware of its importance	3	1.0
--Delete global items	3	1.0
--Should be given at final exam time	3	1.0
--Establish weighted values for questions	3	1.0
--Substitute class visitations for CIS	2	0.7
--Do it earlier in the semester - too hectic at the very end	2	0.7
--Some information on % of participation at various faculty levels would be helpful	1	0.3
--Link merit raises to evaluations for tenured full professors	1	0.3

Table 53

Free-response Item 3. What are two or three things about the current CIS program you really dislike?

Response	N	%
--The percentile rankings	112	33.0
--Should not be used as it is now to make administrative decisions	84	24.8
--Many different types of courses are treated as the same in the comparisons	60	17.7
--Everyone is not evaluated	49	14.5
--Questions ask about "enjoyment" and should ask about learning and work invested in a course	31	9.1
--Many questions are superfluous	30	8.8
--The multiple-choice questions (i.e., they want more written comments)	24	7.1
--Students use it to "get back at" teachers they don't like or who gave them a bad grade	24	7.1
--Difficult to interpret the results (i.e., they don't like the -2 to +2)	23	6.8
--Students don't take them seriously	22	6.5
--It penalizes teachers whose high standards challenge students	21	6.2
--The students on the fringes skew the ratings	21	6.2
--Too long	20	5.9
--Evaluation comes too late to help the students in that class	19	5.6
--Students cannot evaluate reliably what is "effective teaching"	19	5.6
--It's a popularity poll	18	5.3
--No serious dislikes	18	5.3
--The premise that it forces the instructor to "teach to the evaluation" (i.e., they water-down their courses)	16	4.7

(continued)

Table 53 (continued)

Free-response Item 3. What are two or three things about the current CIS program you really dislike?

Response	N	%
--It does not effectively evaluate all types of courses (e.g., grad. seminars, studio classes, PHE activities, etc.)	11	3.2
--It does not help make adjustments to the course	8	2.4
--Students should have to sign them	5	1.5
--Having students administer it is a headache	4	1.2
--Everything	3	0.9
--Faculty [members] are so concerned about ratings that diagnostic information is lost on them	2	0.6
--Only one copy of the written comments is provided	2	0.6

were the student demographic information in general and the student estimate of course grade.

The faculty were asked to react to five commonly heard comments. Faculty responses indicated that student ratings on different items are seen as contradictory, CIS results are frequently misused by administrators and budget councils, ratings comprise more of a popularity contest than an indicator of teaching effectiveness, and ratings do not accurately reflect the quality of teaching. Despite these sentiments, the faculty thought that students are knowledgeable enough to give valid ratings of teaching effectiveness.

The faculty members were asked how easy it is to interpret the CIS results. As would be expected, they showed a fair amount of confidence in their own ability to interpret the CIS results and a fair amount of uncertainty about others' ability to do the same. Administrators and students were seen as having the most difficulty in interpreting CIS results.

Over 90% of the faculty members who responded to the survey frequently or always participate in the CIS. Specifically, the CIS results are used most frequently for improvement in general teaching skills and in specific course improvement because the CIS is seen as a good source of information in these two areas. Lack of faith in the CIS as an information source in recommending courses to students is also evident, with 75% of the faculty seldom or never using it for this purpose. This means that faculty members do not, in general, release their CIS results to students. About half of the faculty report using the CIS results for promotion and tenure decisions even though the CIS is considered a poor source of information for such decisions. Although administration of the CIS is not mandatory for the majority of them, faculty members believe that it is expected of them. Therefore, faculty members present CIS results for promotion and tenure decisions when, in fact, they believe student evaluations are a poor source of such information.

At least 40% of the faculty respondents thought that student evaluations should be required every semester for each of the faculty ranks. About 20% of the faculty indicated that evaluations should be optional and

that they should not be required of any faculty member. Taken together with their responses to most of the other questions, these viewpoints would seem to indicate that faculty opinion about the CIS program is split. There are those who are positive about the CIS, and there are others who are negative.

The recommended length of the CIS survey was from 10 to 29 items. More than half the faculty members were interested in a midsemester evaluation. Ratings of some alternative formats indicated that faculty members were most interested in a set of forms appropriate to different class types and a questionnaire with three separate sections--one with global evaluative items, one with items on teaching method, and one with items dealing with the course content. The least desirable alternative format was a "cafeteria" style set of questions from which each instructor could choose a unique set.

Finally, from the free-response items it is evident that, of the current CIS program, the written comments are the most liked and the percentile rankings are the most disliked by the faculty. To make the CIS more useful, the most frequent faculty suggestion was to compare only similar courses and ranks.

POSTSCRIPT

Shortly after the MEC-CTE survey was conducted and the results summarized, the U.T. Austin Faculty Senate appointed a Teaching Effectiveness Committee to study the issues involved in systems for obtaining student ratings of instruction and to make some recommendations. Subsequently, one of the committee members requested input from MEC and CTE staff members. The decision was made to prepare a joint proposal to study the feasibility of revising the entire CIS program. The proposal was drafted, based largely on this survey's results, and delivered to the Teaching Effectiveness Committee (see copy in Appendix B). Later, the Faculty Senate and the University Council voted unanimously to endorse the proposal, as amended, and sent the legislation to President Peter T. Flawn for consideration in April of 1983. As of the date of completion of this report, he has yet to act upon the recommendation.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

CIS Revision Survey

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

CIS REVISION SURVEY

A JOINT PROJECT OF

THE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION CTR. and THE CTR. FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Have you ever had any questions about or ideas for changing the Course Instructor Survey? Do you know of anyone else who has had a question about, or idea for changing the CIS?

It's hard to imagine any instructor at UT who would not answer "yes" to at least one of these questions. We at CTE and MEC are very aware of this and have decided to do something about it if the demand is great enough.

Please give us the benefit of your experience by responding to the attached questionnaire. The responses will be consolidated and used to help us decide what direction our revision efforts should take. The greater the number of respondents, the better our ability to capture a sense of current opinion and the greater the responsiveness of our subsequent revisions, so please take the time to respond. We think you may find the questions interesting.

DIRECTIONS:

Do not fill in any of the identifying information on the answer sheet. Respond only to the numbered questions which follow, and please use a No. 2 pencil to mark the computer response form. Please note that the numbers which correspond to the options for each question are located inside the circles to be filled in. Also note that most of the response options begin with number 1.

In responding to the free response items at the end, please write on the questionnaire itself. You may use the back of the sheet also, if needed.

Your responses to both parts of this survey will be anonymous unless you choose to identify yourself.

When you have completed the survey, please return the answer sheet and written comments to:

Bill Koch
Measurement and Evaluation Center
BWY 311
(Campus Mail)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

1. Which of the following best describes your current feelings about the overall CIS system?
   1. The system should be left alone as it is.
   2. The system should be retained but with minor revisions.
   3. The system should be retained but with major revisions.
   4. Each college should administer its own system with no attempt at a University-wide system.
   5. The system should be abolished as an organized service.

COMMONLY HEARD COMMENTS

We frequently hear the following comments presented as faculty opinion about the CIS program, but we have no real data to indicate how widespread these opinions are. Please give us your reactions to them, using the following scale:

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5

2. Student ratings from the CIS questionnaire do not accurately reflect the quality of my teaching.
3. Students are usually not knowledgeable enough to give valid ratings of teaching effectiveness.
4. Student ratings comprise more of a popularity contest than an indicator of teaching effectiveness.
5. Administrators and budget councils frequently misuse the CIS results.
6. The ratings a student gives for different items often seem to contradict each other.

The following three sets of questions will help us pinpoint areas on which we should concentrate our efforts.

THE CIS AS AN INFORMATION SOURCE

How would you rate the CIS as it currently exists as an information source in the following situations?

poor source		uncertain		good source
1	2	3	4	5

7. When used by the individual instructor for general teaching improvement.
8. When used by the individual instructor for specific course improvement.
9. When used by students to select courses.
10. When used by administrators to assist faculty in setting teaching improvement goals.
11. When used by administrators to compare teaching of faculty members for merit raises, promotion, tenure decisions.

USEFULNESS OF THE COMPONENTS

How would you assess the usefulness of the following parts of the current CIS and the results print-out?

not useful		uncertain		very useful	not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6

12. frequency of students choosing each response
13. average score on each item
14. percent below, same, and above breakdown on each item
15. percentile rank on each item
16. global rating items (e.g., "compared with all other instructors. . . . ")
17. explanatory material which accompanies the results
18. student demographic information in general
19. student estimate of course grade
20. student grade point average
21. student major
22. reason for taking course
23. written comments

EASE OF INTERPRETATION

How easy to you think it is for people in the following groups to interpret the results of the CIS as they are currently presented?

very difficult		not sure		very easy
1	2	3	4	5

24. yourself
25. faculty members in general
26. administrators
27. students

SOME ALTERNATIVE FORMATS

The following are some alternative systems for student evaluations in use at other institutions. How would you rate the desirability of these various types for U.T.?

wouldn't work		uncertain		sounds good
1	2	3	4	5

28. A set of forms appropriate to different class types (lecture, discussion, lab).
29. Different forms among colleges but consistent within a college.
30. A "cafeteria" style set of questions from which each instructor can choose a unique set.
31. A set of "global" items common to all questionnaires for comparison, plus a separate "pick your own" section tailored to the individual course.
32. A questionnaire with three separate sections — one with global evaluative items, one with items for specific feedback on teaching and one with information for prospective students.
33. A questionnaire with three separate sections — one with global evaluative items, one with items on teaching method, and one with items dealing with the course content.
34. How many items do you think should be on the CIS questionnaire?

    1. less than 10
    2. 10–19
    3. 20–29
    4. 30–39
    5. 40+

35. Recent CTE studies indicate a potential usefulness of having an evaluation partway through the semester for diagnostic feedback. If such a system were readily available, how likely would you be to use it on a regular basis?

very unlikely		not sure		very likely
1	2	3	4	5

Should student evaluations be made mandatory: (select one of the five options below for Items 36–41)

1. optional only, never required
2. required once every 2-5 years
3. required at critical decision points
4. required once per year
5. required every semester

36. for Full Professors?
37. for Associate Professors?
38. for Assistant Professors?
39. for Assistant Instructors?
40. for Teaching Assistants?
41. for other non-tenure appointments? (i.e., temporary or lecturers)

BACKGROUND DATA

Please use the following scale to respond to items 42–47.

never	seldom	occasionally	frequently	always
1	2	3	4	5

42. How often do you participate in the CIS?

How often you do use the CIS results for:

43. Improvement in general teaching skills?
44. Specific course improvement?
45. Information for students in their class selection?
46. Information for administrators in annual reviews?
47. Information for promotion and tenure reviews?

48. What is your faculty rank?

1. Professor
2. Associate Professor
3. Assistant Professor
4. Instructor
5. Assistant Instructor
6. Teaching Assistant
7. Other

49. What type of course do you usually teach? (Mark all that apply)

0. large lecture (over 100)
1. small lecture (100 or less)
2. discussion
3. laboratory
4. seminar
5. individual study
6. practicum
7. studio courses
8. clinical
9. other

50. How many undergraduate courses do you usually teach per year? 1 2 3 4 5 6
51. How many graduate courses do you usually teach per year? 1 2 3 4 5 6

In which college(s) do you teach?

52-1 Architecture
52-2 Business Administration
52-3 Communication
52-4 Education
52-5 Engineering
53-1 Fine Arts
53-2 Law
53-3 Liberal Arts
53-4 Library Science
53-5 Natural Science
54-1 Nursing
54-2 Pharmacy
54-3 Social Work
54-4 LBJ School

FREE RESPONSE ITEMS

The comments that students write on the answer sheet are often regarded as the most valuable part of the survey. We want your written comments on the following items, as well as any other thoughts that may have occurred to you. Write your responses directly on this page and send it along with the answer sheet.

1. What are two or three things about the current CIS program that you really like?

2. What changes could be made in the current CIS program to make it more useful to you?

3. What are two or three things about the current CIS program that you really dislike?

APPENDIX B

Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty: University Council
Proposal to Redesign the System for Obtaining Student
Evaluation and Feedback on Instruction

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL PROPOSAL TO REDESIGN THE SYSTEM FOR OBTAINING STUDENT EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION

At its meeting on March 21, 1983, the University Council adopted the proposals set forth below. These proposals are classified as major legislation, and as such are being submitted to members of the General Faculty for approval as General Faculty legislation.

Notice is hereby given that this motion will be presented to the Board of Regents for adoption unless signed protests in writing, with reasons, have been received by the Secretary of the General Faculty from ten of the voting members of the General Faculty within ten working days of the date of this publication, in which case the motion will be presented to the General Faculty in formal session for decision.

If this legislation is not protested, it will be transmitted through appropriate channels for Regental approval.

Protests must be received in the Office of the General Faculty by April 14, 1983, to be counted.

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL PROPOSAL TO REDESIGN THE SYSTEM FOR OBTAINING STUDENT EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION

Early in the 1982 Fall Semester the Faculty Senate created a Committee on Course-Instructor Evaluations. That Committee asked the Measurement and Evaluation Center and the Center for Teaching Effectiveness to make recommendations concerning ways in which the present Course-Instructor Surveys could be made more useful. In response, staff members of the two Centers jointly prepared and transmitted to the Committee for its consideration a proposal to redesign the system for obtaining student evaluation and feedback on instruction.

As noted in their transmittal memorandum, H. Paul Kelley and James E. Stice, Directors of the two Centers, believe that these recommendations will be feasible in terms of both technology and cost, but cost estimates have not yet been prepared. If the recommendations are acceptable from the policy point of view, then the two Centers will be pleased to explore thoroughly their implications in terms of cost and logistics.

The Committee on Course-Instructor Evaluations subsequently submitted the following endorsements to the Faculty Senate:

> It is our view that the Kelley/Stice recommendations complement and effectively implement many of the items in our own earlier report to the Faculty Senate; thus, we support its adoption. We especially endorse the following in their proposal:
>
> 1) that student evaluations "should be only one piece of evidence among a variety of sources about the quality of instruction";
>
> 2) that since student evaluations address three kinds of audiences they should take three different forms;
>
> 3) that student evaluations aimed at the student audience should be conducted outside of class;
>
> 4) that different forms should be made available for different kinds of classes;
>
> 5) that instructors should be allowed to add questions to the forms they use and to explain any special circumstances concerning the teaching of a particular course;
>
> 6) that the new procedures should be considered experimental and evaluated on a regular basis;
>
> 7) that, except for re-norming purposes, participation in student evaluations should be established by the instructors or in accordance with policies established by the faculty of each college or department. [As amended by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1983.]

On February 7, 1983, the Faculty Senate discussed the proposal and the committee endorsements at length, amended them, and then voted without opposition to recommend that the University Council (1) approve in principle the three proposals to redesign the system for obtaining student feedback on instruction, prepared jointly by the Center for Teaching Effectiveness and the Measurement and Evaluation Center, and (2) ask the President to authorize the implementation of the proposal as soon as it is feasible to do so if the precise system to be implemented has been approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Course-Instructor Evaluations.

On March 21, 1983, the University Council discussed the Faculty Senate proposal and recommendations at length, amended them, and then adopted without opposition the following motion: "The University Council

approves in principle the [proposal] to redesign the system for obtaining student feedback on instruction prepared jointly by the Center for Teaching Effectiveness and the Measurement and Evaluation Center [as amended by the Faculty Senate and the University Council]. This proposal shall be implemented as soon as it is feasible to do so after the precise system and instruments have been approved by a Committee of the University Council with membership from faculty, students, and administration."

Reproduced below is the proposal as amended and adopted by the University Council on March 21, 1983.

PROPOSAL TO REDESIGN THE SYSTEM FOR OBTAINING STUDENT EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION

PREPARED JOINTLY BY THE CENTER FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
AND THE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION CENTER,
AND AMENDED BY THE FACULTY SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

While it should first be recognized that we feel that students are a valuable source of information about an instructor's teaching, we would like to stress the fact that such input should be only one piece of evidence among a variety of sources about the quality of instruction. We urge all parties to seek a number of different ways of gathering information, of which one would be current student input. For now, however, the only readily available information on teaching comes from the Course-Instructor Surveys. Therefore the focus of these proposals is the modification of that system to meet better the needs of the audiences served.

The current system for obtaining student evaluations of courses is trying to serve three, disparate purposes:

1) to give instructors feedback which may be used for the improvement of courses and teaching;
2) to give administrators information to serve as additional input to the evaluation of teaching for promotion, tenure, and merit awards;
3) to give students information on which to base course selection.

Let us consider the student input process from each of these three perspectives.

From an Instructional Improvement Perspective

In order for a student input system to assist the instructor in instructional improvement, it needs to be adaptable to a wide variety of teaching styles and course procedures. It must be responsive to changing conditions across semesters as instructors explore new alternatives. It needs to be specific enough that the instructor can identify areas of the course which need improvement and what kinds of improvements would be possible. And, finally, confidentiality should be built into the process

so that instructors will feel free to try new ideas even if they fail, and students will feel free to give honest feedback. All of this should be done in such a way as to produce maximum information with maximum honesty and minimum disruption of class time.

From an Administrative Decision-Making Perspective

To be used for administrative decision-making purposes, a student input system needs to provide administrators with information that speaks to their concerns for the long-range goals of the administrative unit in a brief, but informative format since they must scan a great deal of data when making decisions on promotion, tenure, and merit awards. Also, since these are frequently very difficult choices, the system must provide comparative information across courses, and the comparisons must be based on valid and reliable items, honest student responses, and well-documented normative data.

From a Student Decision-Making Perspective

Students are searching for information which will help them make choices among the array of available courses and instructors. Only a few of the items in the current survey system address the specific decision-making concerns of the students, and what few there are do not appear on all the alternative forms, thus making cross-course comparisons very difficult. Adding to the difficulty is the fact that even that information is not available on all courses because instructors may not participate or may not release their results. Therefore the students need information which specifically addresses their questions about choosing among alternatives, and this information needs to be available on a common, cross-course basis for all courses taught.

In addition to the perspectives outlined above, the system must be simple to operate so that it does not bog down of its own weight, and cost-effective enough to avoid bankruptcy. From an ethical perspective, the rights and privacy of all participants should be respected as much as possible.

To accomplish the above goals, we recommend that the current Course-Instructor Surveys be divided into a new set of Student Input Systems designed specifically to address the concerns just outlined. The systems would consist of three segments, as follow:

Proposal 1: Instructor Information System -- for Instructional Improvement

We recommend that the current sets of scaled items be replaced with four free response, open-ended items plus smaller sets of scaled items directed at different types of courses. The four free-response items would be:

1) What in the course has helped you the most or do you like the best? (Please consider such things as class procedures, tests and other assignments, reading

materials, interpersonal aspects of the course, atmosphere, and so on).
2) What has interfered with your learning in the course?
3) What changes would you make if you were the instructor to avoid the problems you've mentioned in item 2?
4) What else could the instructor do to improve his/her course and teaching?

A separate set of specialized scaled items would be developed for each type of class format, such as:

1. Large lecture section
2. Small lecture section
3. Recitation/review/discussion section
4. Seminar
5. Self-paced instruction
6. Laboratory
7. Practicum/clinical setting
8. Studio Course
9. Student Teaching Course

Each of these separate sets would be limited to no more than ten items. Some examples of these items would be:

1. It was easy to take notes from your lectures.
2. The grading system that you used was fair.
3. You allowed students to develop their own ideas.
4. You modeled good professional values and standards.
5. You provided criticism in a constructive manner.

Procedure: The Instructor Information System would be conducted in class in a manner similar to the current procedures. If the instructor wished, he or she could include additional questions of interest in this section simply by asking the students to respond to them. The written responses and the summary of the scaled items would be for the instructor's use only. Comparison data for scaled items would be available based on all instructors who chose the same set of scaled items. Participation requirements would be determined by the colleges/schools or departments as they are now.

Rationale:

1) This recommendation is prompted by the response of the faculty to the survey we conducted last spring. The responses were overwhelmingly in favor of student written comments as the most useful source of information for instructional improvement. We also note this to be the case in consultations done at CTE as well. 2) The four written items being proposed are universally applicable to classes of all kinds. 3) The sets of scaled items would be tailored to specific types of classes, such as those listed above. Therefore, the diverse needs of all departments could be met with a smaller number of forms than are presently in use. 4)

The nature of this information would make it most useful for the individual instructor and inappropriate for the other audiences. Their needs would be met elsewhere, leaving the instructor free to use this information as he/she might see fit. 5) The time in class spent on student input would probably not change very much, but the quality and amount of information obtained from the same amount of time would increase.

Proposal 2: Administrator Information System -- for Administrative Decision-making

We suggest that four or five scaled items for administrative purposes be developed and used across all classes and instructors, with participation requirements being determined by the colleges or departments as they are now. These items would be identified by surveying administrators and budget council members; then the items would be carefully screened and validated, and a variety of norms would be developed to back them up. Approximately every four years, comprehensive norms would be established, using standard statistical methods, so that comparisons among faculty members could be made in a meaningful fashion. Three or four open-ended questions appropriate for administrative use should also be included.

Procedure: Actual administration of the Administrator Information System would also be similar to the current procedures. Administration could be done in conjunction with the Instructor Information System or by itself as a separate evaluation. The form would be administered in the class, as it is now, and would consist of a small number of global items, possibly accompanied by some student demographic items. The instructor would be asked to complete a course description sheet containing such things as class type, class size, course level, to accompany the results. The results would be summarized and made available to administrators in a manner similar to the current system. Some examples of these items might be:

1. The course as a whole was:
2. The course content was:
3. The teaching effectiveness of the instructor was
4. The instructor's contribution to my understanding of the subject matter was:

with a set of possible responses such as excellent, above average, average, below average and poor. Provision would be made so that, if it wished to do so, a particular school or college could include a small set of additional items for all of its own courses, and college-wide norms could be developed for such items.

The major difference between this new procedure and the current system would be in the way the items are produced and the results reported. Because of the importance of these items, they would be carefully selected and their validity and reliability would be empirically

verified. Most important of all, however, would be the procedure used for developing normative data against which responses to these items would be compared. For example, a set of items would be thoroughly tested for reliability and validity (including content validity evaluations by faculty and administrators; concurrent validity with other measures of effectiveness, such as interviews, class visits, materials examinations, exit interviews, enrollment figures, comparison of known discriminably-different groups; and including reliability measures such as internal consistency indices and item/total coefficients of correlation, etc.).

A re-norming process would be required approximately once every four years to maintain the currency of the comparison standards. This would require that every instructor participate in the process in every course, including multiple sections of the same course, for one semester only. The results would be kept totally confidential and used only for the production of norms. The individual results would not be available to anyone, including the instructors themselves, since there would be no unique number or other identifying information on the forms to connect the data with a specific class or instructor. (Instructors who wanted to receive copies of the Administrator Information reports that semester could make special arrangements to do so, such as by filling out a cover sheet to provide identifying information.) These forms would contain some student demographic items but not student name or identification number, and would be accompanied by a form that the instructor would complete which would provide information such as class size, type and course level.

The data generated under these conditions would be used to produce a series of norms against which future results of participating instructors could be compared. The data collected during this norming semester would represent the entire population of instructors and courses. The results could be broken down according to the class characteristics such as size, type and course level as well as by instructor characteristics such as rank and college/school, to produce as many different comparisons as desired.

During regular semesters, participation in the Administrator Information System would be up to the instructor or in accordance with policies established by the college or department. Results of those evaluations would then be compared with the norms produced for all instructors or norms for appropriate subgroups of instructors rather than norms only for those instructors who chose to participate. This would make the comparative data more meaningful.

Rationale:

1) Administrators do not need the kind of detailed information about instruction that is required for instructional development. They also do not need the same kinds of information that students need.

They need primarily comparative data on which to base administrative decisions; and they probably would prefer such information in a short, well-documented version such as that described above.

2) It is important that comparisons among instructors be made using an appropriate comparison group rather than a self-selected sample as is currently the case. The procedures just described would provide such a comparison group without seriously infringing on the rights of those faculty members who legitimately do not wish to participate in a student input system on a regular basis, for whatever reason.

Proposal 3: Student Information System -- for Student Decision-making

We recommend that the student needs be met by separating the Student Information System from the Instructor and Administrator Information Systems.

Procedure: Instead of collecting this type of information from a class as a unit during class time, we would ask each student at some other time and place to complete a small set of information items for each course in which he/she is enrolled that semester; for example, this could be done at the time of preregistration. The items would be those of most interest to students, and the number of items would be restricted to about five per course. Although the ultimate choice of items must be based on student decisions, some possibilities are:

1. Sensitivity to needs and feelings of students:
2. Use of examples and illustrations:
3. Intellectual stimulation:
4. Instructor's accessibility to students:
5. Fairness of evaluation of student performance:

with a set of possible responses such as excellent, above average, average, below average and poor.

MEC and CTE would be responsible for assisting the Senior Cabinet and the Student Association in wording the items they want to use. MEC would develop an optically-scannable form for the items and would be certain that adequate supplies of the form would be available each semester. MEC would scan the response forms collected at preregistration (or by any other method chosen by the student representatives), and produce summaries of class results grouped by unique numbers. The individual class summaries could then be given to the instructors, and the entire group of summaries could be published in the "Student Guide to Courses and Instructors" (possibly along with other information the instructors might wish to provide). Studies of the reliability and validity of the surveys shall be conducted by the Measurement and Evaluation Center at least once every four years, and the results shall be made available to the Senior Cabinet and the Student Association.

Rationale:

1) The types of information which would be useful to an instructor and an administrator would be of little use to students in selecting classes. Therefore, the students should be allowed to identify what items would be most useful to them and to revise their selections from one year to another.

2) By switching control of participation in the Student Information System from the instructor to the student, the students would be able to avoid the problem of instructor non-participation. Students would also be taking on more control and more responsibility for the amount and quality of information obtained.

In Summary

The three-pronged system just described would meet the diverse needs of the audiences represented in the University without violating the rights and privacy of any group. We believe it can be a workable way to provide improved student input into all three processes served less well by the present Course-Instructor Surveys.

Implementation of the system would also require active participation from all three groups involved. All groups, through their representatives, would have to help identify strengths and potential weaknesses in the system from the points of view of their particular constituents. There would be a need for education of members of all groups as to appropriate ways to use the information generated by the system. With their cooperation, we believe that this can be a truly innovative answer to the concerns expressed by faculty members, administrators, and students.

Distributed to members of the General Faculty on March 31, 1983.